arXiv:0810.1126v3 [math.DS] 26 Feb 2010

Spectra of Ruelle transfer operators for Axiom A flows on basic sets

Luchezar Stoyanov

Abstract. For Axiom A flows on basic sets satisfying certain additional conditions we prove strong spectral estimates for Ruelle transfer operators similar to these of Dolgopyat [D2] for geodesic flows on compact surfaces (for general potentials) and transitive Anosov flows on compact manifolds with C^1 jointly non-integrable horocycle foliations (for the Sinai-Bowen-Ruelle potential). Here we deal with general potentials. As is now well known, such results have deep implications in some related areas, e.g. in studying analytic properties of Ruelle zeta functions and partial differential operators, closed orbit counting functions, decay of correlations for Hölder continuous potentials. The situation considered here is much more difficult than that in [D2] since in general the local geometry of the basic set, especially in higher dimensions, can be rather complicated. In fact, in higher dimensions even the Anosov case for general potentials presents substantial difficulties.

1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction and main results

Let $\phi_t : M \longrightarrow M$ be a C^2 Axiom A flow on a C^2 complete (not necessarily compact) Riemann manifold M and let Λ be a basic set for ϕ_t. Let $\|\cdot\|$ be the *norm* on T_xM determined by the Riemann metric on M and let $E^u(x)$ and $E^s(x)$ $(x \in \Lambda)$ be the tangent spaces to the strong unstable and stable manifolds $W^u_\epsilon(x)$ and $W^s_\epsilon(x)$, respectively (see Sect. 2). For any $x \in \Lambda$, $T > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, \epsilon]$ set

$$B^u_T(x,\delta) = \{y \in W^u_\epsilon(x) : d(\phi_t(x), \phi_t(y)) \leq \delta \ , \ \ 0 \leq t \leq T\} \ .$$

We will say that ϕ_t has a *regular distortion along unstable manifolds* over the basic set Λ if there exists a constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$ with the following properties:

(a) For any $0 < \delta \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ there exists a constant $R = R(\delta, \epsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\operatorname{diam}(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(z,\epsilon)) \leq R \operatorname{diam}(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(z,\delta)) \tag{1.1}$$

for any $z \in \Lambda$ and any $T > 0$.

(b) For any $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ and any $\rho \in (0, 1)$ there exists $\delta \in (0, \epsilon]$ such that for any $z \in \Lambda$ and any $T > 0$ we have $\operatorname{diam}(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(z,\delta)) \leq \rho \operatorname{diam}(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(z,\epsilon))$.

Part (a) of the above condition resembles the Second Volume Lemma of Bowen and Ruelle [BR] about balls in Bowen's metric; this time however we deal with diameters instead of volumes. In Sect. 8 below we describe a rather general class of flows on basic sets satisfying this condition. There are reasons to believe that this may actually hold for all C^2 flows on basic sets – see the comments at the end of this subsection.

In this paper we deal with flows ϕ_t over basic sets Λ having a regular distortion along unstable manifolds. Apart from that, in the main result below we impose an additional condition on ϕ_t and Λ, called the *local non-integrability condition* (LNIC); it is stated in Sect. 2 below. Let us just mention here that this condition is weaker than the uniform non-integrability condition (UNI) of Chernov [Ch1] and Dolgopyat [D2], and it is always satisfied e.g. for contact flows that are either Anosov (i.e. $\Lambda = M$), or have one-dimensional (un)stable manifolds (see Sect. 8 below). One would expect that (LNIC) is satisfied in most interesting cases. For example, it was shown in [St2] that open billiard flows (in any dimension) with C^1 (un)stable laminations over the non-wandering set Λ always satisfy (LNIC).

Let $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be a Markov family for ϕ_t over Λ consisting of rectangles $R_i = [U_i, S_i]$, where U_i (resp. S_i) are (admissible) subsets of $W^u_\epsilon(z_i) \cap \Lambda$ (resp. $W^s_\epsilon(z_i) \cap \Lambda$) for some $\epsilon > 0$ and $z_i \in \Lambda$ (cf. Sect.2. for details). Assuming that the local stable and unstable laminations over Λ are Lipschitz, the *first return time function* $\tau : R = \cup_{i=1}^k R_i \longrightarrow [0, \infty)$ and the standard Poincaré map $\mathcal{P} : R \longrightarrow R$ are (essentially) Lipschitz. Setting $U = \cup_{i=1}^k U_i$, the *shift map* $\sigma : U \longrightarrow U$ is defined by $\sigma = p \circ \mathcal{P}$, where $p : R \longrightarrow U$ is the projection along the leaves of local stable manifolds. Let $\widehat{U}$ be the set of all $u \in U$ whose orbits do not have common points with the boundary of R (see Sect. 2). Given a Lipschitz real-valued function f on $\widehat{U}$, set $g = g_f = f - P\tau$, where $P = P_f \in \mathbb{R}$ is the unique number such that the topological pressure $\mathrm{Pr}_\sigma(g)$ of g with respect to σ is zero (cf. e.g. [PP]). For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, one defines the *Ruelle transfer operator* $L_{g-(a+\mathbf{i}b)\tau} : C^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U}) \longrightarrow C^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$ in the usual way (cf. Sect. 2). Here $C^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$ is the space of Lipschitz functions $g : \widehat{U} \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}$. By $\mathrm{Lip}(g)$ we denote the Lipschitz constant of g and by $\|g\|_0$ the *standard* sup *norm* of g on $\widehat{U}$.

We will say that the *Ruelle transfer operators related to the function f on $\widehat{U}$ are eventually contracting* if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exist constants $0 < \rho < 1$, $a_0 > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that if $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $|a| \leq a_0$ and $|b| \geq 1/a_0$, then for every integer $m > 0$ and every $h \in C^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$ we have

$$\|L^m_{f-(P_f+a+\mathbf{i}b)\tau} h\|_{\mathrm{Lip},b} \leq C\, \rho^m\, |b|^\epsilon\, \|h\|_{\mathrm{Lip},b}\ ,$$

where the norm $\|.\|_{\mathrm{Lip},b}$ on $C^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$ is defined by $\|h\|_{\mathrm{Lip},b} = \|h\|_0 + \frac{\mathrm{Lip}(h)}{|b|}$. This implies in particular that the spectral radius of $L_{f-(P_f+a+\mathbf{i}b)\tau}$ on $C^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$ does not exceed ρ.

Our main result in this paper is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\phi_t : M \longrightarrow M$ be a C^2 Axiom A flow on a C^2 complete Riemann manifold satisfying the condition (LNIC) and having a regular distortion along unstable manifolds over a basic set Λ. Assume in addition that the local holonomy maps along stable laminations through Λ are uniformly Lipschitz. Then for any Lipschitz real-valued function f on $\widehat{U}$ the Ruelle transfer operators related to f are eventually contracting.*

We refer the reader to Sect. 2 below for the definition of holonomy maps. It is known that the uniform Lipschitzness of the local stable holonomy maps can be derived from certain bunching condition concerning the rates of expansion/contraction of the flow along local unstable/stable manifolds over Λ (see [Ha1], [Ha2], [PSW]).

It should be mentioned that some kind of a non-inegrability assumption is necessary for results like Theorem 1.1 (and Corollary 1.2). Indeed, Pollicott [Po] and Ruelle [R2] have constructed examples of Axiom A flows with jointly integrable stable and unstable laminations for which the statements of Corollaries 1.4 and 1.5 below (and therefore that of Theorem 1.1 as well) do not hold. As one can see in Sect. 2 below, (LNIC) is a rather weak non-integrability condition. Moreover, in the contact case it follows from another condition (see (ND) in Sect. 9 below) which looks rather natural and is always satisfied for Anosov flows.

It follows from Theorem 7.1 below that a flow with one-dimensional unstable laminations over a basic set Λ always has a regular distortion along unstable manifolds. Moreover, if such a flow is Anosov or contact, it always satisfies (LNIC) (see Proposition 9.1 below). Thus, we get the following immediate consequence of Theorem 1.1.

Corollary 1.2. *Let $\phi_t : M \longrightarrow M$ be a C^2 flow on a C^2 Riemann manifold and let Λ be a basic set for ϕ_t such that the stable and unstable laminations over Λ are one-dimensional. Assume in addition one of the following: (i) the flow is contact, or (ii) the flow is Anosov and the stable and unstable laminations over Λ are jointly non-integrable. Then the Ruelle transfer operators related to any Lipschitz real-valued function f on $\widehat{U}$ are eventually contracting.*

The above was first proved by Dolgopyat ([D1], [D2]) in the case of geodesic flows on compact surfaces. The second main result in [D2] concerns transitive Anosov flows on compact Riemann manifolds with C^1 jointly non-integrable local stable and unstable foliations. For such flows Dolgopyat proved that the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 holds for the Sinai-Bowen-Ruelle potential $f = \log \det(d\phi_\tau)_{|E^u}$. Theorem 1.1 appears to be first result of this kind that works for any potential and in any dimension[1].

For contact Anosov flows in any dimension (LNIC) is always satisfied (see Proposition 9.1 below), so the following is also an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.1.

Corollary 1.3. *Let $\phi_t : M \longrightarrow M$ be a C^2 contact Anosov flow on a compact Riemann manifold having a regular distortion along unstable manifolds over M and such that the local holonomy maps along stable laminations through Λ are uniformly Lipschitz. Then the Ruelle transfer operators related to any Lipschitz real-valued function f on $\widehat{U}$ are eventually contracting.*

Using a smoothing procedure as in [D2] (see also Corollary 3.3 in [St1]), an estimate similar to that in Theorem 1.1 holds for the Ruelle operator acting on the space $\mathcal{F}_\gamma(U)$ of Hölder continuous functions with respect to an appropriate norm $\| \cdot \|_{\gamma,b,U}$.

Using Theorem 1.1 and an argument of Pollicott and Sharp [PoS1] one derives valuable information about the *Ruelle zeta function* $\zeta(s) = \prod_\gamma (1 - e^{-s\ell(\gamma)})^{-1}$, where γ runs over the set of primitive closed orbits of $\phi_t : \Lambda \longrightarrow \Lambda$ and $\ell(\gamma)$ is the least period of γ. In what follows h_T denotes the *topological entropy* of ϕ_t on Λ.

Corollary 1.4. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 1.1, Corollary 1.2 or Corollary 1.3, the zeta function $\zeta(s)$ of the flow $\phi_t : \Lambda \longrightarrow \Lambda$ has an analytic and non-vanishing continuation in a half-plane $\mathrm{Re}(s) > c_0$ for some $c_0 < h_T$ except for a simple pole at $s = h_T$. Moreover, there exists $c \in (0, h_T)$ such that*

$$\pi(\lambda) = \#\{\gamma : \ell(\gamma) \leq \lambda\} = \mathrm{li}(e^{h_T\lambda}) + O(e^{c\lambda})$$

as $\lambda \to \infty$, where $\mathrm{li}(x) = \displaystyle\int_2^x \frac{du}{\log u} \sim \frac{x}{\log x}$ *as $x \to \infty$.*

As another consequence of Theorem 1.1 and the procedure described in [D2] one gets exponential decay of correlations for the flow $\phi_t : \Lambda \longrightarrow \Lambda$.

Given $\alpha > 0$ denote by $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(\Lambda)$ the set of *Hölder continuous functions* with Hölder exponent α and by $\|h\|_\alpha$ the *Hölder constant* of $h \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha(\Lambda)$.

Corollary 1.5. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 1.1, Corollary 1.2 or Corollary 1.3, let F be a Hölder continuous function on Λ and let ν_F be the Gibbs measure determined by F on Λ. Assume in addition that the manifold M and the flow ϕ_t are C^5. For every $\alpha > 0$ there exist constants $C = C(\alpha) > 0$ and $c = c(\alpha) > 0$ such that*

$$\left| \int_\Lambda A(x)B(\phi_t(x))\, d\nu_F(x) - \left(\int_\Lambda A(x)\, d\nu_F(x)\right) \left(\int_\Lambda B(x)\, d\nu_F(x)\right) \right| \leq Ce^{-ct}\|A\|_\alpha\, \|B\|_\alpha$$

for any two functions $A, B \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha(\Lambda)$.

There has been a considerable activity in recent times to establish exponential and other types of decay of correlations for various kinds of systems with some highly rated results of Chernov

---

[1] Albeit under additional conditions but this appears to be inevitable.

[Ch1], Dolgopyat [D1], [D2], Liverani [L1], [L2], Young [Y1], [Y2]. See also [BSC], [BaT], [T], [Ch2], [Ch3], [GL], [D3], [FMT], [Mel], [ChY] and the references there. In [L2] Liverani proves exponential decay of correlations for contact Anosov flows, and this appears to be the most general result of this kind so far. Recently Tsujii [T] obtained finer results for the same kind of flows. It should be stressed that in [L2] and [T] (and various other works; see the references there) spectral properties of a different kind of transfer operators are studied, namely the operators $\mathcal{L}_t g = g \circ \phi_{-t}$ ($t \in \mathbb{R}$) acting on functions g on a compact manifold M, ϕ_t being a contact Anosov flow on M.

The so called Ruelle transfer operators studied here appear to be more difficult to deal with, since they are intimately related to geometric properties of the flow (and the basic set Λ when Axiom A flows are considered). On the other hand, spectral results of the kind obtained in Theorem 1.1 appear to be much finer and to have a wider and deeper range of applications.

In [St1] a modification of the method from [D2] was used to prove an analogue of Corollary 1.2 above for open billiard flows in the plane. Using similar tools, Naud [N] proved a similar result for geodesic flows on convex co-compact hyperbolic surfaces. The results in both [St1] and [N] are special cases of Corollary 1.2. Baladi and Vallée ([BaV]) obtained Dolgopyat type estimates for transfer operators in the case of a suspension of an interval map.

It has been well known since Dolgopyat's paper [D2] that strong spectral estimates for Ruelle transfer operators as the ones described in Theorem 1.1 lead to deep results concerning zeta functions and related topics which are difficult to obtain by other means. For example, such estimates were fundamental in [PoS1], where the statement of Corollary 1.4 was proved for geodesic flows on compact surfaces of negative curvature. For the same kind of flows, fine and very interesting asymptotic estimates for pairs of closed geodesics were established in [PoS3], again by using the strong spectral estimates in [D2]. For Anosov flows with C^1 jointly non-integrable horocycle foliations full asymptotic expansions for counting functions similar to $\pi(\lambda)$ however with some homological constraints were obtained in [An] and [PoS2]. In [PeS2] Theorem 1.1 above was used to obtain results similar to these in [PoS3] about correlations for pairs of closed billiard trajectories for billiard flows in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$, where K is a finite disjoint union of strictly convex compact bodies with smooth boundaries satisfying the so called 'no eclipse condition' (and some additional conditions as well). For the same kind of models and using Theorem 1.1 again, a rather non-trivial result was established in [PeS1] about analytic continuation of the cut-off resolvent of the Dirichlet Laplacian in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$, which appears to be the first of its kind in the field of quantum chaotic scattering. It is not clear at all how such a result could be proved without using the strong spectral estimates of the kind considered here.

The main part of this article consists of Sects. 3-5 where Theorem 1.1 is proved. Sect. 2 contains some basic definitions and facts. The regular distortion along unstable manifolds has some natural consequences about diameters of cylinders defined by means of Markov families – these are derived in Sect. 3. The essential part of the proof of Theorem 1.1 is in Sects. 4-5.

In Sects. 6-9 we describe classes of flows over basic sets satisfying the conditions in Theorem 1.1 Sects. 6 and 7 deal with flows over basic sets satisfying a certain pinching condition (P). In Sect. 6 we prove that under this condition the flow ϕ_t on unstable manifolds is locally conjugate to its linearization $d\phi_t$ via C^1 (local) maps with uniformly bounded derivatives. Linearization via a family of homeomorphisms exists in the general case (see Sect. 4 in [PS]), however it is not clear whether one can make it Lipschitz without any additional conditions. The arguments used to prove some recent results on smoothness of the linearizing homeomorphism in Hartman-Grobman type theorems do not seem to be easily applicable to vector bundles (see [GHR] and the references there). The linearization from Sect. 6 is used in Sect. 7 to show that the pinching condition (P) implies regular distortion along unstable manifolds.

A much more general class of flows on basic sets is described in Sect. 8. Here we consider the so called lower unstable pinching condition (LUPC), where a condition similar to (P) is applied only to the 'lower part of the spectrum' of the flow on unstable manifolds – the rest of the spectrum is arbitrary except that it should be uniformly separated from the lower part. Under this condition[2] we use slight modifications of the arguments from Sects. 6 and 7 to derive regular distortion along unstable manifolds. It should be stressed that the central part of the arguments in Sects. 7 and 8 is to prove a local version of regular distortion along unstable manifolds, where e.g. (1.1) is satisfied at a single point $z \in \Lambda$ (with a constant $R = R(z, \delta, \epsilon)$ depending on z as well) – see Lemma 7.2 below. It is not difficult to see (using a variation of the arguments in Sects. 6-8) that a similar local result can be proved at Lyapunov regular points $z \in \Lambda$ for any C^2 flow on any basic set[3]. It is not yet clear how one can get a uniform global result over Λ from such local results.

In Sect. 9 we compare several non-integrability conditions, while Appendix A contains the proofs of some technical lemmas from Sects. 3-7. Finally, in Appendix B we prove Lemma 8.4 (the central point in Sect. 8) by using rather easy modifications of arguments from Sects. 6, 7.

1.2 Comments on the proof of the main result

In the proof of Theorem 1.1 we use the general framework of Dolgopyat's method from [D1], [D2] and its modification in [St1], however a significant new development is necessary. The main difficulty comes from the fact that very little is known about the (geometric) structure of the set Λ. For general potentials f the original method in [D2] was only applied to geodesic flows on surfaces. It requires much more sophisticated arguments to deal with general potentials for flows on higher-dimensional spaces, especially when the flow is considered over a basic set (possibly with a rather complicated fractal structure) rather than on a nice smooth compact manifold.

In this subsection we make some general remarks about the main points in the proof of Theorem 1.1. Given $f \in C^{\text{Lip}}(U)$, one wants to show that large powers of the Ruelle transfer operator $L_r = L_{f-(P_f+a+\mathbf{i}\,b)\tau}$ are contracting for small $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and large $b \in \mathbb{R}$. For any integer $N > 0$ we have

$$L_r^N h(x) = \sum_{\sigma^N(y)=x} e^{r_N(y)}\, h(y) \;, \tag{1.2}$$

where $r_N(y) = r(y) + r(\sigma(y)) + \ldots + r(\sigma^{N-1}(y))$. One of the main steps in [D2] is to define appropriately C^1 inverses $v_1, v_2 : U_0 \longrightarrow U$ of σ^N, i.e. $\sigma^N(v_i(x)) = x$ for x in some 'small' open subset U_0 of U. For these one ultimetely shows that for large N there exists $\lambda \in (0,1)$ such that

$$|e^{r_N(v_1(x))}\, h(v_1(x)) + e^{r_N(v_2(x))}\, h(v_2(x))| \leq \lambda\, [|e^{r_N(v_1(x))}|\, h(v_1(x)) + |e^{r_N(v_2(x))}|\, h(v_2(x))] \tag{1.3}$$

for small $|a|$ and large $|b|$ (of magnitude depending on N) and $h \in C^1(U)$ with $h > 0$, $\|h\| \leq \text{Const}$, $\|dh\| \leq \text{Const}\ |b|$. This leads to a similar estimate for the whole sum in (1.2). To make this cancellation mechanism[4] work for general complex-valued functions h, one uses estimates involving $\mathcal{N}_J|h|$, where $\{\mathcal{N}_J\}$ is a finite family of specially defined operators acting on positive functions in $C^1(U)$ with bounded logarithmic derivatives. One of the main features of Dolgopyat's operators $\mathcal{N}_J$ is that they are L^2-contractions with respect to the invariant Gibbs measure ν determined by $f - P\,\tau$ on U, and this is crucial for the proof of the main result.

The whole procedure is rather more complicated than the above, and we refer the reader to Sect. 5 below for more details. It is worth mentioning though that it is the construction of the inverses v_1 and v_2 of σ^N and the proof of their main properties where the joint non-integrability of the stable and unstable families is used. In [D2] this results in finding C^1 vector fields $e_1(z), \ldots, e_n(z)$ defined in a small neighbourhood U_0 of a point $z_0 \in U$ so that for large N,

---

[2] We also assume that the lower part of the spectrum is integrable.

[3] Now the role of the 'bottom of the unstable spectrum' is played by the exponential of the least positive Lyapunov exponent.

[4] To use the words of Liverani [L2] who is using a similar idea.

$$|\partial_{e_1}(\tau_N(v_1(u)) - \tau_N(v_2(u)))| \geq \epsilon \quad , \quad u \in U_0 \; , \tag{1.4}$$

$$|\partial_{e_i}(\tau_N(v_1(u)) - \tau_N(v_2(u)))| << \epsilon \quad , \; i > 1 \; , \; u \in U_0 \; . \tag{1.5}$$

Notice that $e^{\mathbf{i}\, b\, \tau_N(y)}$ is the 'tricky' part of the exponential term $e^{r_N(y)}$ in (1.2). With (1.4) and (1.5) one has that if $u, u' \in U_0$ are $C\epsilon$-close however there is a $c\epsilon$-gap between their first coordinates (with respect to the vector field e_1) for some constants $C > c > 0$, then

$$\left| [\tau_N(v_1(u)) - \tau_N(v_2(u))] - [\tau_N(v_1(u')) - \tau_N(v_2(u'))] \right| \geq \text{const } \epsilon \; . \tag{1.6}$$

This is what lies beneath the proof of (1.2).

In [St1] a modification of the above was used to deal with open billiard flows in the plane. In this case the unstable manifolds are one-dimensional, so one has just one vector field $e_1(u)$, however U is a Cantor set, so the construction of $v_1(u)$ and $v_2(u)$ is non-trivial. One of the main difficulties in [St1] was to show (using specific features of the model) that there exist constants $c_2 > c_1 > 0$ such that for any $\epsilon > 0$, U can be partitioned into intervals of lengths between $c_1\epsilon$ and $c_2\epsilon$ such that successive intervals with common points with Λ have a gap of a similar size between them[5]. Then the one-dimensionality of the unstable manifolds allows to construct the functions $v_i(u)$ and prove (1.4). Moreover for any of the small intervals Δ_1 in the partition of U intersecting Λ one can find another interval Δ_2 intersecting Λ with a $c_1\epsilon$-gap between Δ_1 and Δ_2 such that (1.6) holds for all $u \in \Delta_1$ and all $u' \in \Delta_2$. The rest of Dolgopyat's method was not so difficult to apply, although extra modifications were necessary to deal with the singularity of the Gibbs measures in this case.

In the present paper the dimension n of the unstable manifolds is arbitrary and the set Λ can be 'anything from a Cantor set to a manifold'. Therefore to construct vector fields $e_i(u)$ in a neighbourhood U_0 of a point $z_0 \in U$ with (1.4) and (1.5) is meaningless, unless we know that there are 'many points' of Λ in the direction of $e_1(u)$ (or 'very close' to it) for a 'large set' of u's in U_0. To establish something like this however seems impossible without assuming anything in the spirit of the extra condition (LNIC) from Sect. 2 below. With (LNIC), one constructs for large $N > 0$ a pair of inverses $v_1(u)$ and $v_2(u)$ of σ^N such that the analogue of (1.4) holds on a neighbourhood of z with e_1 replaced by unit vectors a in a cone whose axis is a parallel translate of b. The above gives that if $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ are two cylinders in the vicinity of z of size $\leq \delta$, for some small $\delta > 0$, that can be 'separated by a plane whose normal is close to b' (one can make sense of this by using some parametrization of U near z), then (1.6) holds for all $u \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and all $u' \in \mathcal{C}_2$. However, since $n > 1$ in general, just one direction b does not give enough opportunities to separate cylinders. So, one needs to construct a finite number of directions $b_1, \ldots, b_{j_0}$ tangent to Λ (at various points close to the initial point z_0), and for each $j = 1, \ldots, j_0$, a pair of inverses $v_1^{(j)}(u)$ and $v_2^{(j)}(u)$ of σ^N defined on some small open subset U_0 of U such that 'sufficiently many' pairs of cylinders in U_0 of size $\leq \delta$ can be separated by planes each of them having a 'normal close to some b_j', and this can be done for all δ in some interval $(0, \delta']$. This is the content of the main Lemma 4.3.

From Lemma 4.3 and the other constructions in Sect. 4 one gets some analogue of (1.6) involving different pairs of inverses $v_1^{(j)}(u)$ and $v_2^{(j)}(u)$, and this turns out to be enough to implement an essentially modified analytic part of Dolgopyat's method. This is done in Sect. 5. Significant new development is necessary due again to the unknown structure of Λ. What saves a lot of potential extra problems is the fact that we work with a new metric D on U (or rather on the subset $\widehat{U}$ of U) defined by means of cylinders. It turns out that this metric fits well with the (modified) Dolgopyat operators $\mathcal{N}_J$ and makes them work in a truly multidimensional situation. Moreover, with this new metric there is no need for the Gibbs measure ν to have the so called Federer property (see [D2]). In fact, it is not clear at all whether ν has this property in the cases we consider.

---

[5] The same idea was later used in [N] to deal with limit sets of convex co-compact hyperbolic surfaces.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout this paper M denotes a C^2 complete (not necessarily compact) Riemann manifold, and $\phi_t : M \longrightarrow M$ $(t \in \mathbb{R})$ a C^2 flow on M. A ϕ_t-invariant closed subset Λ of M is called *hyperbolic* if Λ contains no fixed points and there exist constants $C > 0$ and $0 < \lambda < 1$ such that there exists a $d\phi_t$-invariant decomposition $T_xM = E^0(x) \oplus E^u(x) \oplus E^s(x)$ of T_xM $(x \in \Lambda)$ into a direct sum of non-zero linear subspaces, where $E^0(x)$ is the one-dimensional subspace determined by the direction of the flow at x, $\|d\phi_t(u)\| \leq C\,\lambda^t\,\|u\|$ for all $u \in E^s(x)$ and $t \geq 0$, and $\|d\phi_t(u)\| \leq C\,\lambda^{-t}\,\|u\|$ for all $u \in E^u(x)$ and $t \leq 0$.

The flow ϕ_t is called an *Axiom A flow* on M if the non-wandering set of ϕ_t is a disjoint union of a finite set consisting of fixed hyperbolic points and a compact hyperbolic subset containing no fixed points in which the periodic points are dense (see e.g. [KH]). A non-empty compact ϕ_t-invariant hyperbolic subset Λ of M which is not a single closed orbit is called a *basic set* for ϕ_t if ϕ_t is transitive on Λ and Λ is locally maximal, i.e. there exists an open neighbourhood V of Λ in M such that $\Lambda = \cap_{t\in\mathbb{R}}\phi_t(V)$. When M is compact and M itself is a basic set, ϕ_t is called an *Anosov flow.*

For $x \in \Lambda$ and a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ let

$$W^s_\epsilon(x) = \{y \in M : d(\phi_t(x), \phi_t(y)) \leq \epsilon \text{ for all } t \geq 0\ ,\ d(\phi_t(x), \phi_t(y)) \to_{t\to\infty} 0\ \}\ ,$$

$$W^u_\epsilon(x) = \{y \in M : d(\phi_t(x), \phi_t(y)) \leq \epsilon \text{ for all } t \leq 0\ ,\ d(\phi_t(x), \phi_t(y)) \to_{t\to-\infty} 0\ \}$$

be the (strong) *stable* and *unstable manifolds* of size ϵ. Then $E^u(x) = T_xW^u_\epsilon(x)$ and $E^s(x) = T_xW^s_\epsilon(x)$. Given $\delta > 0$, set $E^u(x;\delta) = \{u \in E^u(x) : \|u\| \leq \delta\}$; $E^s(x;\delta)$ is defined similarly. For any $A \subset M$ and $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ denote $\phi_I(A) = \{\ \phi_t(y)\ :\ y \in A, t \in I\ \}$.

It follows from the hyperbolicity of Λ that if $\epsilon_0 > 0$ is sufficiently small, there exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that if $x, y \in \Lambda$ and $d(x, y) < \epsilon_1$, then $W^s_{\epsilon_0}(x)$ and $\phi_{[-\epsilon_0,\epsilon_0]}(W^u_{\epsilon_0}(y))$ intersect at exactly one point $[x, y] \in \Lambda$ (cf. [KH]). That is, there exists a unique $t \in [-\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0]$ such that $\phi_t([x, y]) \in W^u_{\epsilon_0}(y)$. Setting $\Delta(x, y) = t$, defines the so called *temporal distance function* ([KB],[Ch1], [D2]) which will be used significantly throughout this paper. For $x, y \in \Lambda$ with $d(x, y) < \epsilon_1$, define $\pi_y(x) = [x, y] = W^s_\epsilon(x) \cap \phi_{[-\epsilon_0,\epsilon_0]}(W^u_{\epsilon_0}(y))$. Thus, for a fixed $y \in \Lambda$, $\pi_y : W \longrightarrow \phi_{[-\epsilon_0,\epsilon_0]}(W^u_{\epsilon_0}(y))$ is the *projection* along local stable manifolds defined on a small open neighbourhood W of y in Λ. Choosing $\epsilon_1 \in (0, \epsilon_0)$ sufficiently small, the restriction $\pi_y : \phi_{[-\epsilon_1,\epsilon_1]}(W^u_{\epsilon_1}(x)) \longrightarrow \phi_{[-\epsilon_0,\epsilon_0]}(W^u_{\epsilon_0}(y))$ is called a *local stable holonomy map*[6]. Combining such a map with a shift along the flow we get another local stable holonomy map $\mathcal{H}^y_x : W^u_{\epsilon_1}(x) \cap \Lambda \longrightarrow W^u_{\epsilon_0}(y) \cap \Lambda$. In a similar way one defines local holonomy maps along unstable laminations.

Given $z \in \Lambda$, let $\exp^u_z : E^u(z;\epsilon_0) \longrightarrow W^u_{\epsilon_0}(z)$ and $\exp^s_z : E^s(z;\epsilon_0) \longrightarrow W^s_{\epsilon_0}(z)$ be the corresponding *exponential maps.* A vector $b \in E^u(z) \setminus \{0\}$ will be called *tangent to* Λ at z if there exist infinite sequences $\{v^{(m)}\} \subset E^u(z)$ and $\{t_m\} \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\exp^u_z(t_m\, v^{(m)}) \in \Lambda \cap W^u_\epsilon(z)$ for all m, $v^{(m)} \to b$ and $t_m \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. It is easy to see that a vector $b \in E^u(z) \setminus \{0\}$ is tangent to Λ at z if there exists a C^1 curve $z(t)$ $(0 \leq t \leq a)$ in $W^u_\epsilon(z)$ for some $a > 0$ with $z(0) = z$ and $\dot{z}(0) = b$ such that $z(t) \in \Lambda$ for arbitrarily small $t > 0$.

---

[6] In a similar way one can define holonomy maps between any two sufficiently close local transversals to stable laminations; see e.g. [PSW].

The following is the *local non-integrability condition* for ϕ_t and Λ mentioned in Sect. 1.

(LNIC): *There exist* $z_0 \in \Lambda$, $\epsilon_0 > 0$ *and* $\theta_0 > 0$ *such that for any* $\hat{z} \in \Lambda \cap W^u_{\epsilon_0}(z_0)$ *and any tangent vector* $b \in E^u(\hat{z})$ *to* Λ *at* $\hat{z}$ *with* $\|b\| = 1$ *there exist* $\tilde{z} \in \Lambda \cap W^u_{\epsilon_0}(z_0)$ *arbitrarily close to* $\hat{z}$, $\tilde{y} \in \Lambda \cap W^s_{\epsilon_0}(\tilde{z}) \setminus \{\tilde{z}\}$ *arbitrarily close to* $\tilde{z}$, $\delta = \delta(\tilde{z}, \tilde{y}) > 0$ *and* $\epsilon' = \epsilon'(\tilde{z}, \tilde{y}) > 0$ *such that* $|\Delta(\exp^u_z(v), \pi_{\tilde{y}}(z))| \geq \delta\, \|v\|$ *for all* $z \in W^u_{\epsilon_0}(z_0) \cap \Lambda$ *with* $d(z, \tilde{z}) < \epsilon'$ *and* $v \in E^u(z; \epsilon')$ *with* $\exp^u_z(v) \in \Lambda$ *and* $\langle \frac{v}{\|v\|}, b_z \rangle \geq \theta_0$, *where* b_z *is the parallel translation of* b *along the geodesic in* $W^u_{\epsilon_0}(z_0)$ *from* $\hat{z}$ *to* z.

It is shown in Sect. 8 below that the uniform non-integrability condition (UNI) of Chernov [Ch1] and Dolgopyat [D2] implies (LNIC)[7].

Given $A \subset \Lambda$ we will denote by $\mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(A)$ and $\partial_\Lambda A$ the *interior* and the *boundary* of the subset A of Λ in the topology of Λ, and by $\mathrm{diam}(A)$ the *diameter* of A. We will say that A is an *admissible subset* of $W^u_\epsilon(z) \cap \Lambda$ $(z \in \Lambda)$ if A coincides with the closure of its interior in $W^u_\epsilon(z) \cap \Lambda$. Admissible subsets of $W^s_\epsilon(z) \cap \Lambda$ are defined similarly. Following [D2], a subset R of Λ will be called a *rectangle* if it has the form $R = [U, S] = \{[x, y] : x \in U, y \in S\}$, where U and S are admissible subsets of $W^u_\epsilon(z) \cap \Lambda$ and $W^s_\epsilon(z) \cap \Lambda$, respectively, for some $z \in \Lambda$. For such R, given $\xi = [x, y] \in R$, set $W^u_R(\xi) = \{[x', y] : x' \in U\}$ and $W^s_R(\xi) = \{[x, y'] : y' \in S\} \subset W^s_{\epsilon_0}(x)$.

Let $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be a family of rectangles with $R_i = [U_i, S_i]$, $U_i \subset W^u_\epsilon(z_i) \cap \Lambda$ and $S_i \subset W^s_\epsilon(z_i) \cap \Lambda$, respectively, for some $z_i \in \Lambda$. Set $R = \cup_{i=1}^k R_i$. The family $\mathcal{R}$ is called *complete* if there exists $T > 0$ such that for every $x \in \Lambda$, $\phi_t(x) \in R$ for some $t \in (0, T]$. The *Poincaré map* $\mathcal{P} : R \longrightarrow R$ related to a complete family $\mathcal{R}$ is defined by $\mathcal{P}(x) = \phi_{\tau(x)}(x) \in R$, where $\tau(x) > 0$ is the smallest positive time with $\phi_{\tau(x)}(x) \in R$. The function τ is called the *first return time* associated with $\mathcal{R}$. A complete family $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i\}_{i=1}^k$ of rectangles in Λ is called a *Markov family* of size $\chi > 0$ for the flow ϕ_t if $\mathrm{diam}(R_i) < \chi$ for all i and: (a) for any $i \neq j$ and any $x \in \mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(R_i) \cap \mathcal{P}^{-1}(\mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(R_j))$ we have $\mathcal{P}(\mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(W^s_{R_i}(x))) \subset \mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(W^s_{R_j}(\mathcal{P}(x)))$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(W^u_{R_i}(x))) \supset \mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(W^u_{R_j}(\mathcal{P}(x)))$; (b) for any $i \neq j$ at least one of the sets $R_i \cap \phi_{[0,\chi]}(R_j)$ and $R_j \cap \phi_{[0,\chi]}(R_i)$ is empty.

The existence of a Markov family $\mathcal{R}$ of an arbitrarily small size $\chi > 0$ for ϕ_t follows from the construction of Bowen [B] (cf. also Ratner [Ra]).

From now on we will assume that $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i\}_{i=1}^k$ is a fixed Markov family for ϕ_t of size $\chi < \epsilon_0/2 < 1$. Set $U = \cup_{i=1}^k U_i$. The *shift map* $\sigma : U \longrightarrow U$ is given by $\sigma = \pi^{(U)} \circ \mathcal{P}$, where $\pi^{(U)} : R \longrightarrow U$ is the *projection* along stable leaves. Notice that τ is constant on each stable leaf $W^s_{R_i}(x) = W^s_{\epsilon_0}(x) \cap R_i$. For any integer $m \geq 1$ and any function $h : U \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ define $h_m : U \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ by $h_m(u) = h(u) + h(\sigma(u)) + \ldots + h(\sigma^{m-1}(u))$.

Denote by $\widehat{U}$ the *core* of U, i.e. the set of those $x \in U$ such that $\mathcal{P}^m(x) \in \mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(R)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. It is well-known (see [B]) that $\widehat{U}$ is a residual subset of U and has full measure with respect to any Gibbs measure on U. Clearly in general τ is not continuous on U, however τ is Lipschitz on $\widehat{U}$. The same applies to $\sigma : \widehat{U} \longrightarrow \widehat{U}$. Throughout we will mainly work with the restrictions of τ and σ to $\widehat{U}$. Set $\widehat{U}_i = U_i \cap \widehat{U}$.

Let $B(\widehat{U})$ be the *space of bounded functions* $g : \widehat{U} \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ with its standard norm $\|g\|_0 = \sup_{x \in \widehat{U}} |g(x)|$. Given a function $g \in B(\widehat{U})$, the *Ruelle transfer operator* $L_g : B(\widehat{U}) \longrightarrow B(\widehat{U})$ is defined by $(L_g h)(u) = \displaystyle\sum_{\sigma(v) = u} e^{g(v)} h(v)$. If $g \in B(\widehat{U})$ is Lipschitz on $\widehat{U}$, then L_g preserves the space $C^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$ of *Lipschitz functions* $g : \widehat{U} \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}$.

---

[7] In fact, Chernov and Dolgopyat used (UNI) only for Anosov flows on 3-dimensional manifolds. It is quite clear that when $\dim E^u(x) > 1$ $(x \in \Lambda)$, (LNIC) is a much weaker condition than (UNI).

In what follows we will assume that f is a **fixed real-valued function in** $C^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$. Let $P = P_f$ be the unique real number so that $\mathrm{Pr}_\sigma(f - P\,\tau) = 0$, where $\mathrm{Pr}_\sigma(h)$ is the *topological pressure* of h with respect to the shift map σ (see e.g. [PP]). Set $g = g_f = f - P\,\tau$.

By Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius' Theorem (see e.g. Ch. 2 in [PP]) for any real number a with $|a|$ sufficiently small, as an operator on $C^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$, $L_{f-(P+a)\tau}$ has a *largest eigenvalue* λ_a and there exists a (unique) regular probability measure $\hat{\nu}_a$ on U with $L^*_{f-(P+a)\tau}\hat{\nu}_a = \lambda_a\,\hat{\nu}_a$, i.e. $\int L_{f-(P+a)\tau}H\,d\hat{\nu}_a = \lambda_a \int H\,d\hat{\nu}_a$ for any $H \in C(U)$. Fix a corresponding (positive) eigenfunction $h_a \in C^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$ such that $\int h_a\,d\hat{\nu}_a = 1$. Then $d\nu = h_0\,d\hat{\nu}_0$ defines a *σ-invariant probability measure* ν on U. Since $\mathrm{Pr}_\sigma(f - P\tau) = 0$, it follows from the main properties of pressure (cf. e.g. Ch. 3 in [PP]) that $|\mathrm{Pr}_\sigma(f - (P+a)\tau)| \leq |\tau|_\infty\,|a|$. Moreover, for small $|a|$ the maximal eigenvalue λ_a and the eigenfunction h_a are Lipschitz in a, so there exist constants $a'_0 > 0$ and $C_0 > 0$ such that $|h_a - h_0| \leq C_0|a|$ on $\widehat{U}$ and $|\lambda_a - 1| \leq C_0|a|$ for $|a| \leq a'_0$.

For $|a| \leq a'_0$, as in [D2], consider the function

$$f^{(a)}(u) = f(u) - (P+a)\tau(u) + \ln h_a(u) - \ln h_a(\sigma(u)) - \ln \lambda_a$$

and the operators

$$L_{ab} = L_{f^{(a)}-\mathbf{i}\,b\tau} : C^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U}) \longrightarrow C^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U}) \quad , \quad \mathcal{M}_a = L_{f^{(a)}} : C^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U}) \longrightarrow C^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U}) \;.$$

One checks that $\mathcal{M}_a\,1 = 1$ and $|(L^m_{ab}h)(u)| \leq (\mathcal{M}^m_a|h|)(u)$ for all $u \in \widehat{U}$, $h \in C^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$ and $m \geq 0$. It is also easy to check that $L^*_{f^{(0)}}\nu = \nu$, i.e. $\int L_{f^{(0)}}H\,d\nu = \int H\,d\nu$ for any $H \in C^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$.

The hyperbolicity of the flow on Λ implies the existence of constants $c_0 \in (0,1]$ and $\gamma_1 > \gamma > 1$ such that

$$c_0\gamma^m\,d(u_1,u_2) \leq d(\sigma^m(u_1),\sigma^m(u_2)) \leq \frac{\gamma_1^m}{c_0}d(u_1,u_2) \tag{2.1}$$

whenever $\sigma^j(u_1)$ and $\sigma^j(u_2)$ belong to the same $\mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(U_{i_j})$ for all $j = 0,1\ldots,m$.

Set $\tilde{\tau} = \max\{\,\|\tau\|_0\,,\,\mathrm{Lip}(\tau_{|\widehat{U}})\,\}$. Assuming that the constant $a'_0 > 0$ is sufficiently small, there exists $T = T(a'_0)$ such that

$$T \geq \max\{\,\|f^{(a)}\|_0\,,\,\mathrm{Lip}(f^{(a)}_{|\widehat{U}})\,,\,\tilde{\tau}\,\} \tag{2.2}$$

for all $|a| \leq a'_0$. Fix $a'_0 > 0$ and $T > 0$ and with these properties. Taking the constant $C_0 > 0$ sufficiently large, we have $|f^{(a)} - f^{(0)}| \leq C_0|a|$ on $\widehat{U}$ for $|a| \leq a'_0$. From now on **we will assume that c_0, C_0, γ and γ_1 are fixed constants** with the above properties.

3 Some properties of cylinders

Let again $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be a fixed Markov family as in Sect.2. Define the matrix $A = (A_{ij})_{i,j=1}^k$ by $A_{ij} = 1$ if $\mathcal{P}(\mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(R_i)) \cap \mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(R_j) \neq \emptyset$ and $A_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. According to [BR] (see Sect. 2 there), we may assume that $\mathcal{R}$ is chosen in such a way that $A^{M_0} > 0$ (all entries of the M_0-fold product of A by itself are positive) for some integer $M_0 > 0$. In what follows we assume that the matrix A has this property.

Given a finite string $\imath = (i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_m)$ of integers $i_j \in \{1,\ldots,k\}$, we will say that $\imath$ is *admissible* if for any $j = 0,1,\ldots,m-1$ we have $A_{i_j i_{j+1}} = 1$. Given an admissible string $\imath$, denote by $\overset{\circ}{C}[\imath]$ the set of those $x \in U$ so that $\sigma^j(x) \in \mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(U_{i_j})$ for all $j = 0,1,\ldots,m$. The set $C[\imath] = \overline{\overset{\circ}{C}[\imath]} \subset \Lambda$ will be called a *cylinder* of length m in U, while $\overset{\circ}{C}[\imath]$ will be called an *open* *cylinder* of length m. It follows from the properties of the Markov family that $\overset{\circ}{C}[\imath]$ is an open dense subset of $C[\imath]$. Any cylinder of the form $C[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_m, i_{m+1}, \dots, i_{m+q}]$ will be called a *subcylinder* of $C[\imath]$ of *co-length* q.

In what follows the cylinders considered are always defined by finite admissible strings.

The σ-invariant probability measure ν on U defined in Sect. 2 above is a *Gibbs measure* related to $g = f - P\tau$ (cf. [Si], [R2] or [PP]). It follows from $\mathrm{Pr}_\sigma(g) = 0$, and the properties of Gibbs measures that there exist constants $c_2 > c_1 > 0$ such that

$$c_1 \leq \frac{\nu(C[\imath])}{e^{g_m(y)}} \leq c_2 \tag{3.1}$$

for any cylinder $C[\imath]$ of length m in U and any $y \in C[\imath]$. It is well-known (see [B]) that the core $\widehat{U}$ of U (see Sect. 2) is a residual subset of U and $\nu(\widehat{U}) = 1$. Notice that for any cylinder $C[\imath]$ the set $\widehat{C}[\imath] = C[\imath] \cap \widehat{U}$ is dense in $C[\imath]$ and $\nu(\widehat{C}[\imath]) = \nu(C[\imath])$.

Given $x \in U_i$ for some i and $r > 0$ we will denote by $B_U(x, r)$ the set of all $y \in U_i$ with $d(x, y) < r$.

The proof of the following proposition is straightforward.

Proposition 3.1. *If for some integer $m \geq 1$ the map $\sigma^m : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}'$ defines a homeomorphism between two open cylinders $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}'$ and $w : \mathcal{C}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is its inverse map, then $w(\mathcal{C}'')$ is an open subcylinder of $\mathcal{C}$ of co-length $q \geq 1$ for every open subcylinder $\mathcal{C}''$ of $\mathcal{C}'$ of co-length q.*

Recall the constants $c_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $\gamma_1 > \gamma > 1$ from Sect. 2, and fix an integer $p_1 \geq 1$ with

$$\rho_0 = \frac{1}{c_0 \gamma^{p_1}} < \min \left\{ \frac{\mathrm{diam}(U_i)}{\mathrm{diam}(U_j)} : i, j = 1, \dots, k \right\} . \tag{3.2}$$

Then clearly $\rho_0 < 1$. Set $\rho_1 = \rho_0^{1/p_1}$ and fix a constant $r_0 > 0$ with $2r_0 < \min\{\mathrm{diam}(U_i) : i = 1, \dots, k\}$ and for each $i = 1, \dots, k$ a point $\hat{z}_i \in \widehat{U}_i$ such that $B_U(\hat{z}_i, r_0) \subset \mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(U_i)$.

The following is an immediate consequence of (2.1).

Lemma 3.2. *There exists a global constant $C_1 > 0$ such that for any cylinder $C[\imath]$ of length m we have* $\mathrm{diam}(C[\imath]) \leq C_1 \rho_1^m$ *and* $\mathrm{diam}(C[\imath]) \geq \frac{c_0 r_0}{\gamma_1^m}$. ■

From now on we will assume that the local stable holonomy maps through Λ are uniformly Lipschitz. Then there exists a constant $K' > 0$ such that $d(\mathcal{H}_x^y(z), \mathcal{H}_x^y(z')) \leq K' d(z, z')$ for all $x, y \in \Lambda$ with $d(x, y) < \epsilon_1$ and $z, z' \in \Lambda \cap W^u_{\epsilon_1}(x)$.

Given $i = 1, \dots, k$, according to the choice of the Markov family $\{R_i\}$, the projection $\mathrm{pr}_{R_i} : W_i = \phi_{[-\chi,\chi]}(R_i) \longrightarrow R_i$ along the flow ϕ_t is well-defined and Lipschitz. Since the projection $\pi_i : R_i \longrightarrow U_i$ along stable leaves is Lipschitz, the map $\psi_i = \pi_i \circ \mathrm{pr}_{R_i} : W_i \longrightarrow W^u_{R_i}(z_i)$ is also Lipschitz. Thus, we may assume the constant $K' > 0$ is chosen sufficiently large so that $d(\psi_i(u), \psi_i(v)) \leq K' d(u, v)$ for all $u, v \in W_i$ and all $i = 1, \dots, k$.

The following lemma describes the main consequences of the flow having a regular distortion along unstable manifolds that will be used in Sects. 4 and 5.

Proposition 3.3. *Assume that ϕ_t has a regular distortion along unstable manifolds over the basic set Λ and that the local stable holonomy maps through Λ are uniformly Lipschitz. Then there exist global constants $0 < \rho < 1$ and $C_1 > 0$ and a positive integer $p_0 \geq 1$ such that:*

(a) *For any cylinder $C[\imath] = C[i_0, \dots, i_m]$ and any subcylinder $C[\imath'] = C[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{m+1}]$ of $C[\imath]$ of co-length 1 we have* $\rho\, \mathrm{diam}(C[\imath]) \leq \mathrm{diam}(C[\imath'])$.

(b) *For any cylinder* $C[\imath] = C[i_0, \ldots, i_m]$ *and any subcylinder* $C[\imath'] = C[i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_{m+1}, \ldots, i_{m+p_0}]$ *of* $C[\imath]$ *of co-length* p_0 *we have* $\mathrm{diam}(C[\imath']) \leq \rho \, \mathrm{diam}(C[\imath])$.

Proof of Proposition 3.3. Notice that the properties of the Markov family (and the fact that $\imath$ is admissible) imply $\sigma^m(\widehat{C}[\imath]) = \widehat{U}_{i_m}$.

(a) Set $z = \hat{z}_{i_{m+1}}$ for brevity, and let $x \in \widehat{C}[\imath']$ be the point such that $\sigma^{m+1}(x) = z$. Set $r_0' = c_0 r_0/\gamma_1 > 0$. Let $R = R(r_0'/K', 2\epsilon_0) > 0$ be the constant from the definition of regular distortion along unstable manifolds with $\delta = r_0'/K'$ and $\epsilon = 2\epsilon_0$ (see Sect. 1). Since $B_U(z, r_0) \subset \mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(U_{i_{m+1}})$, it follows from the properties of σ that $B_U(\sigma^m(x), r_0') \subset \mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(U_{i_m})$. Thus, for $T = \tau_m(x)$ this implies[8] $\Lambda \cap B^u_T(x, r_0'/K') \subset C[\imath']$, so

$$\mathrm{diam}(C[\imath']) \geq \mathrm{diam}(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(x, r_0'/K')) \geq \frac{1}{R} \, \mathrm{diam}(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(x, 2\epsilon_0)) \; .$$

On the other hand, $U_{i_m} \subset B_U(\sigma^m(x), r_1)$ implies $C[\imath] \subset \Lambda \cap B^u_T(x, 2\epsilon_0)$. Indeed, if $y \in C[\imath]$, then $\mathcal{P}^m(y) \in R_{i_m}$ and $\mathcal{P}^m(y) = \phi_t(\phi_T(y))$ for some $|t| \leq \chi < \epsilon_0/2$, where $\phi_T(y) \in W^u_{\epsilon_0}(x)$. So, $d(\phi_T(x), \phi_T(y)) \leq d(\sigma^m(x), \sigma^m(y)) + d(\sigma^m(y), \mathcal{P}^m(y)) + d(\mathcal{P}^m(y), \phi_T(y)) \leq 3\chi < 2\epsilon_0$. Thus, setting $\rho = 1/R$, we get $\rho \, \mathrm{diam}(C[\imath]) \leq \mathrm{diam}(C[\imath'])$.

(b) Choose an arbitrary $\rho \in (0, 1)$ (e.g. take the one from part (a) above), and set $\epsilon = r_0'/K'$. It follows from the condition (b) in the definition of regular distortion along unstable manifolds that there exists $\delta \in (0, r_0'/K']$ such that $\mathrm{diam}(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(x, \delta)) \leq \rho \; \mathrm{diam}(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(x, r_0'/K'))$ for $x \in \Lambda$ and $T \geq 0$. Choose the integer $p_0 \geq 1$ so that $C_1 \, K' \, \rho_1^{p_0} < \delta$.

Let $C[\imath] = C[i_0, \ldots, i_m]$ be an arbitrary cylinder and let $C[\imath'] = C[i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_{m+1}, \ldots, i_{m+p_0}]$ be a subcylinder of $C[\imath]$ of co-length p_0. Let $x \in \widehat{C}[\imath']$ be the point such that $\sigma^{m+p_0}(x) = \hat{z}_{i_{m+p_0}}$ and let $T = \tau_m(x)$. For the cylinder $\mathcal{C}' = C[i_m, i_{m+1}, \ldots, i_{m+p_0}] \subset U_{i_m}$, it follows from Lemma 3.2 that $\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}') \leq C_1 \, \rho_1^{p_0}$, so by the choice of p_0, $\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}') < \delta/K'$ and therefore $\mathcal{C}' \subset B_U(\sigma^m(x), \delta/K')$. Next, we have $C[\imath'] \subset \Lambda \cap B^u_T(x, \delta)$. Indeed, if $y \in C[\imath']$, then $\sigma^m(y) \in \mathcal{C}'$, so $d(\sigma^m(x), \sigma^m(y)) < \delta/K'$. For $T = \tau_m(x)$ we have $\phi_T(y) \in W^u_{\epsilon_0}(\phi_T(x))$, so $d(\phi_T(x), \phi_T(y)) = d(\mathcal{H}^{\phi_T(x)}_{\sigma^m(x)}(\sigma^m(x)), \mathcal{H}^{\phi_T(x)}_{\sigma^m(x)}(\sigma^m(y))) \leq K' \, d(\sigma^m(x), \sigma^m(y)) < \delta$. Thus, $C[\imath'] \subset \Lambda \cap B^u_T(x, \delta)$ and therefore $\mathrm{diam}(C[\imath']) \leq \mathrm{diam}(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(x, \delta)) \leq \rho \; \mathrm{diam}(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(x, r_0/K'))$. On the other hand, $B_U(\sigma^m(x), r_0) \subset \mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(U_{i_m})$ gives $\Lambda \cap B^u_T(x, r_0'/K') \subset C[\imath]$, so $\mathrm{diam}(C[\imath']) \leq \rho \, \mathrm{diam}(C[\imath])$. ■

4 The temporal distance function

Throughout we assume that ϕ_t is a C^2 Axiom A flow on M and Λ is a basic set for ϕ_t satisfying the condition (LNIC) stated in Sect. 2 and such that the local holonomy maps along stable laminations through Λ are uniformly Lipschitz.

The following property of the temporal distance function follows from the Lipschitzness of the local stable holonomy maps and the continuous dependence of $W^u_\epsilon(y)$ on $y \in \Lambda$.

Lemma 4.1. *For any* $\tilde{z} \in \Lambda$ *and any* $\delta > 0$ *there exists* $\epsilon > 0$ *such that for any* $y_1 \in W^s_\epsilon(\tilde{z}) \cap \Lambda$, *if* $y_2 \in W^s_\epsilon(\tilde{z}) \cap \Lambda$ *is sufficiently close to* y_1, *then for any* $z, z' \in \Lambda \cap W^u_\epsilon(\tilde{z})$ *we have*

$$|\Delta(z', \pi_{y_2}(z)) - \Delta(z', \pi_{y_1}(z))| < \delta \, d(z, z') \; .$$

Fix an arbitrary point $z_0 \in \Lambda$ **and constants** $\epsilon_0 > 0$ **and** $\theta_0 \in (0, 1)$ **with the properties described in** (LNIC). Without loss of generality we will assume that $z_0 \in \mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(U_1)$, $U_1 \subset$

---

[8] Since $r_0'/K' < r_0$, for any $y \in \Lambda \cap B^u_T(x, r_0'/K')$ one derives that $\sigma^j(y) \in U_{i_j}$ for all $j = 0, 1, \ldots, m+1$.

$\Lambda \cap W^u_{\epsilon_0}(z_0)$ and $S_1 \subset \Lambda \cap W^s_{\epsilon_0}(z_0)$, where as in Sect. 2, $R_i = [U_i, S_i]$ are the members of the Markov family $\mathcal{R} = \{R_i\}_{i=1}^k$. Fix an arbitrary constant θ_1 such that

$$0 < \theta_0 < \theta_1 < 1 \; .$$

Next, fix an arbitrary orthonormal basis $e_1, \ldots, e_n$ in $E^u(z_0)$ and a C^1 parametrization $r(s) = \exp^u_{z_0}(s)$, $s \in V_0'$, of a small neighbourhood W_0 of z_0 in $W^u_{\epsilon_0}(z_0)$ such that V_0' is a convex compact neighbourhood of 0 in $\mathbb{R}^n \approx \mathrm{span}(e_1, \ldots, e_n) = E^u(z_0)$. Then $r(0) = z_0$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial s_i} r(s)_{|s=0} = e_i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Set $U_0' = W_0 \cap \Lambda$. Shrinking W_0 (and therefore V_0' as well) if necessary, we may assume that $\overline{U_0'} \subset \mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(U_1)$ and $\left| \left\langle \frac{\partial r}{\partial s_i}(s), \frac{\partial r}{\partial s_j}(s) \right\rangle - \delta_{ij} \right|$ is uniformly small for all $i, j = 1, \ldots, n$ and $s \in V_0'$, so that

$$\frac{1}{2}\langle \xi, \eta \rangle \leq \langle \, dr(s) \cdot \xi \; , \; dr(s) \cdot \eta \, \rangle \leq 2 \, \langle \xi, \eta \rangle \quad , \quad \xi, \eta \in E^u(z_0) \; , \; s \in V_0' \; , \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} \, \|s - s'\| \leq d(r(s), r(s')) \leq 2 \, \|s - s'\| \quad , \quad s, s' \in V_0' \; . \tag{4.2}$$

4.2. Definitions. (a) For a cylinder $\mathcal{C} \subset U_0'$ and a unit vector $\xi \in E^u(z_0)$ we will say that a *separation by a ξ-plane occurs* in $\mathcal{C}$ if there exist $u, v \in \mathcal{C}$ with $d(u, v) \geq \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C})$ such that $\left\langle \frac{r^{-1}(v) - r^{-1}(u)}{\|r^{-1}(v) - r^{-1}(u)\|} \; , \; \xi \right\rangle \geq \theta_1$.

Let $\mathcal{S}_\xi$ be the *family of all cylinders* $\mathcal{C}$ contained in U_0' such that a separation by an ξ-plane occurs in $\mathcal{C}$.

(b) Given an open subset V of U_0' which is a finite union of open cylinders and $\delta > 0$, let $\mathcal{C}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{C}_p$ ($p = p(\delta) \geq 1$) be the family of maximal closed cylinders in $\overline{V}$ with $\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}_j) \leq \delta$. For any unit vector $\xi \in E^u(z_0)$ set $M_\xi^{(\delta)}(V) = \cup \{ \mathcal{C}_j : \mathcal{C}_j \in \mathcal{S}_\xi \; , \; 1 \leq j \leq p \}$.

In what follows we will construct, amongst other things, a sequence of unit vectors $\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_{j_0} \in E^u(z_0)$. For each $\ell = 1, \ldots, j_0$ set $B_\ell = \{ \eta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} : \langle \eta, \xi_\ell \rangle \geq \theta_0 \}$. For $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $s \in E^u(z_0)$ set $I_{\eta,t} g(s) = \frac{g(s + t\,\eta) - g(s)}{t}$, $t \neq 0$ (*increment* of g in the direction of η).

Clearly if $x, y \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ are such that $\langle x, y \rangle \leq \theta_1$, then $\|x - y\| \geq \sqrt{2(1 - \theta_1)}$. Thus there exists a positive integer j_0', depending on n only, such that for any finite set $\{x_1, \ldots, x_k\} \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ with $\langle x_i, x_j \rangle \leq \theta_1$ for all $i \neq j$ we have $k \leq j_0'$. **Fix j_0' with this property.**

As another preparatory step, fix $2j_0'$ distinct points $\lambda_i^{(j)} \in \mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(U_1) \setminus \overline{U_0'}$ ($j = 1, \ldots, j_0'$; $i = 1, 2$) and for each $\lambda_i^{(j)}$ **fix a small open neighbourhood** $\widetilde{V}_i^{(j)}$ of its in $\mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(U_1)$ such that the sets $\overline{\widetilde{V}_i^{(j)}}$ ($j = 1, \ldots, j_0'$; $i = 1, 2$) are disjoint and contained in $\mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(U_1)$.

Lemma 4.3. (**Main Lemma**) *There exist an integer j_0 with $1 \leq j_0 \leq j_0'$, open cylinders $U_0^{(j_0)} \subset \ldots \subset U_0^{(1)}$ contained in U_0', and for each $\ell = 1, \ldots, j_0$, an integer $m_\ell \geq 1$ such that the following hold:*

(i) *for each $\ell = 1, \ldots, j_0$ and each $i = 1, 2$, there exists a contracting map $w_i^{(\ell)} : U_0^{(\ell)} \longrightarrow \widetilde{V}_i^{(\ell)}$ such that $\sigma^{m_\ell}(w_i^{(\ell)}(x)) = x$ for all $x \in U_0^{(\ell)}$, $w_i^{(\ell)}(U_0^{(\ell)})$ is an open cylinder in U_1, and $w_i^{(\ell)} : U_0^{(\ell)} \longrightarrow w_i^{(\ell)}(U_0^{(\ell)})$ is a homeomorphism;*

(ii) *for each $\ell = 1, \ldots, j_0$ there exist a number $\hat{\delta}_\ell \in (0, \delta_0)$ and a vector $\xi_\ell \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ such that $|\langle \xi_\ell, \xi_{\ell'} \rangle| \leq \theta_1$ whenever $\ell' \neq \ell$, and*

$$\inf_{0 < |h| \leq \hat{\delta}_\ell} |I_{\eta,h}[\tau_{m_\ell}(w_2^{(\ell)}(r(s))) - \tau_{m_\ell}(w_1^{(\ell)}(r(s)))]| \geq \hat{\delta}_\ell \quad , \quad r(s) \in U_0^{(\ell)} \; , \; \eta \in B_\ell \; ,$$

for all $\ell = 1, \ldots, j_0$*, where the* inf *is taken over* h *with* $r(s + h\eta) \in U_0^{(\ell)}$*.*

(iii) *For any open cylinder* V *in* $U_0^{(j_0)}$ *there exists a constant* $\delta' = \delta'(V) \in (0, \delta_0)$ *such that* $V \subset M_{\xi_1}^{(\delta)}(V) \cup M_{\xi_2}^{(\delta)}(V) \cup \ldots \cup M_{\xi_{j_0}}^{(\delta)}(V)$ *for all* $\delta \in (0, \delta']$.

Remark. Notice that if $\delta' > 0$ and the open cylinder V in U_0' are such that $V \subset \cup_{j=1}^{j_0} M_{\xi_j}^{(\delta)}(V)$ for all $\delta \in (0, \delta']$, then for any open cylinder $W \subset V$ we have $W \subset \cup_{j=1}^{j_0} M_{\xi_j}^{(\delta)}(W)$ for all $\delta \in (0, \delta'']$, where $\delta'' = \min\{\delta', \mathrm{diam}(W)\}$.

Proof of Lemma 4.3. We will construct the required objects by induction.

Step 1. Clearly there exists a unit vector $\xi_1 \in E^u(z_0)$ tangent to Λ at z_0. It then follows from the condition (LNIC) and the choice of z_0 that there exist $\tilde{z} = r(\tilde{s}) \in U_0'$, $\tilde{y} \in W_{R_1}^s(\tilde{z}) \setminus U_1$ (so $\tilde{y} \in \Lambda$), $\delta_1' > 0$ and $\epsilon_1' > 0$ such that

$$|\Delta(r(s + h\,\eta), \pi_{\tilde{y}}(r(s)))| \geq \delta_1'\,|h| \tag{4.3}$$

for all $r(s) \in U_0'$ with $\mathrm{dist}(\tilde{z}, r(s)) < \epsilon_1'$, $\eta \in B_1$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|h| < \epsilon_1'$ and $r(s + h\,\eta) \in U_0'$. We will assume that $\epsilon_1' > 0$ is so small that $B_U(\tilde{z}, \epsilon_1') \subset U_0'$.

Since $\widetilde{V}_1^{(1)}$ and $\widetilde{V}_2^{(1)}$ are open subsets of U having common points with Λ, it follows that $\mathcal{P}^m(\widetilde{V}_1^{(1)})$ and $\mathcal{P}^m(\widetilde{V}_2^{(1)})$ fill in R_1 densily as $m \to \infty$. Using this, it follows that taking $m_1 \geq 1$ large enough we can find $y_1' \in R_1 \cap \mathcal{P}^{m_1}(\widetilde{V}_1^{(1)}) \setminus U_1$ arbitrarily close to $\tilde{y}$ and $y_1'' \in \mathcal{P}^{m_1}(\widetilde{V}_2^{(1)})$ arbitrarily close to $\tilde{z}$ such that $\pi^{(U)}(y_1') = \pi^{(U)}(y_1'') \in U_0' \cap \widehat{U}$. By Lemma 4.1 with $y_1 = \tilde{z}$ and $y_2 = y_1''$, we can make this choice so that for any $z = r(s)$, h and η as above, we have

$$\Delta(r(s + h\,\eta), \pi_{y_1''}(r(s)))| \leq \frac{\delta_1'}{8}\, d(r(s + h\,\eta), r(s)) \leq \frac{\delta_1'\,|h|}{4}\ .$$

Using Lemma 4.1 again with $y = y_1'$ and $y_2 = \tilde{y}$, we get

$$|\Delta(r(s + h\,\eta), \pi_{y_1'}(r(s))) - \Delta(r(s + h\,\eta), \pi_{\tilde{y}}(r(s)))| \leq \frac{\delta_1'\,|h|}{4},$$

provided y_1' is chosen sufficiently close to $\tilde{y}$. Combining the above with (4.3) one gets

$$\begin{aligned} & |\Delta(r(s + h\,\eta), \pi_{y_1'}(r(s))) - \Delta(r(s + h\,\eta), \pi_{y_1''}(r(s)))| \\ \geq\ & |\Delta(r(s + h\,\eta), \pi_{\tilde{y}}(r(s)))| - |\Delta(r(s + h\,\eta), \pi_{y_1''}(r(s)))| \\ & - |\Delta(r(s + h\,\eta), \pi_{y_1'}(r(s))) - \Delta(r(s + h\,\eta), \pi_{\tilde{y}}(r(s)))| \geq \frac{\delta_1'\,|h|}{2}\ . \end{aligned}$$

Thus, there exists an open cylinder $U_0^{(1)}$ contained in $B_U(\tilde{z}, \epsilon_1') \subset U_0'$ with $\zeta_1 = \pi^{(U)}(y_1') = \pi^{(U)}(y_1'') \in U_0^{(1)}$ such that

$$|\Delta(r(s + h\,\eta), \pi_{y_1'}(r(s))) - \Delta(r(s + h\,\eta), \pi_{y_1''}(r(s)))| \geq \hat{\delta}_1\,|h| \tag{4.4}$$

whenever $r(s) \in U_0^{(1)}$, $\eta \in B_1$, $|h| \leq \hat{\delta}_1$ and $r(s + h\eta) \in U_0^{(1)}$, where $\hat{\delta}_1 = \min\{\delta_1'/2, \epsilon_1'\}$. **Fix** $m_1 \geq 1$**,** y_1' **and** y_1'' **with these properties**.

Since $y_1' \in R_1 \cap \mathcal{P}^{m_1}(\widetilde{V}_1^{(1)})$, we have $W_{R_1}^u(y_1') \cap \mathcal{P}^{m_1}(\widetilde{V}_1^{(1)}) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\mathcal{O}_1^{(1)}$ be a small open neighbourhood of y_1' in $W_{R_1}^u(y_1') \cap \mathcal{P}^{m_1}(\widetilde{V}_1^{(1)})$ and let $f_1^{(1)} : \mathcal{O}_1^{(1)} \longrightarrow f_1^{(1)}(\mathcal{O}_1^{(1)}) \subset \widetilde{V}_1^{(1)}$ be a Lipschitz homeomorphism (local inverse of $\mathcal{P}^{m_1}$) such that $\mathcal{P}^{m_1}(f_1^{(1)}(z)) = z$ for all $z \in \mathcal{O}_1^{(1)}$.

Shrinking $U_0^{(1)}$ if necessary, we may assume that $\pi_{y'_1}(U_0^{(1)}) \subset \mathcal{O}_1^{(1)}$. Now define a Lipschitz homeomorphism $w_1^{(1)} : U_0^{(1)} \longrightarrow w_1^{(1)}(U_0^{(1)}) \subset \widetilde{V}_1^{(1)}$ by $w_1^{(1)}(x) = f_1^{(1)}(\pi_{y'_1}(x))$. We then have $\mathcal{P}^{m_1}(w_1^{(1)}(x)) = \pi_{y'_1}(x)$ and therefore $\sigma^{m_1}(w_1^{(1)}(x)) = x$ for all $x \in U_0^{(1)}$. Moreover, $\mathrm{Lip}(w_1^{(1)}) \leq \frac{1}{c_0\, \gamma^{m_1}}$, so assuming m_1 is sufficiently large, $w_1^{(1)}$ is contracting and $w_1^{(1)}(U_0^{(1)})$ is a cylinder.

In the same way one constructs a Lipschitz homeomorphism $w_2^{(1)} : U_0^{(1)} \longrightarrow w_2^{(1)}(U_0^{(1)}) \subset \widetilde{V}_2^{(1)}$ (replacing $U_0^{(1)}$ by a smaller open cylinder if necessary; by Proposition 3.1, $w_1^{(1)}(U_0^{(1)})$ will continue to be a cylinder) such that $w_2^{(1)}(U_0^{(1)})$ is a cylinder and $\mathcal{P}^{m_1}(w_2^{(1)}(x)) = \pi_{y''_1}(x)$ for all $x \in U_0^{(1)}$. Then $\sigma^{m_1}(w_2^{(1)}(x)) = x$ for all $x \in U_0^{(1)}$.

Now for $z = r(s) \in U_0^{(1)}$, $\eta \in B_1$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}$ with $r(s + h\,\eta) \in U_0^{(1)}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& [\tau_{m_1}(w_2^{(1)}(r(s + h\,\eta))) - \tau_{m_1}(w_1^{(1)}(r(s + h\,\eta)))] - [\tau_{m_1}(w_2^{(1)}(r(s))) - \tau_{m_1}(w_1^{(1)}(r(s)))] \\
= \;& [\tau_{m_1}(w_1^{(1)}(r(s))) - \tau_{m_1}(w_1^{(1)}(r(s + h\,\eta)))] - [\tau_{m_1}(w_2^{(1)}(r(s))) - \tau_{m_1}(w_2^{(1)}(r(s + h\,\eta)))] \\
= \;& \Delta(\mathcal{P}^{m_1}(w_1^{(1)}(r(s + h\,a))), \mathcal{P}^{m_1}(w_1^{(1)}(r(s))) - \Delta(\mathcal{P}^{m_1}(w_2^{(1)}(r(s + h\,\eta))), \mathcal{P}^{m_1}(w_2^{(1)}(r(s))) \\
= \;& \Delta(\pi_{y'_1}(r(s + h\,\eta)), \pi_{y'_1}(r(s))) - \Delta(\pi_{y''_1}(r(s + h\,\eta)), \pi_{y''_1}(r(s))) \\
= \;& \Delta(r(s + h\,\eta), \pi_{y'_1}(r(s))) - \Delta(r(s + h\,\eta), \pi_{y''_1}(r(s))) \;.
\end{aligned}$$

This and (4.4) give $|I_{\eta,h}[\tau_{m_1}(w_2^{(1)}(r(s))) - \tau_{m_1}(w_1^{(1)}(r(s)))]| \geq \hat{\delta}_1$ whenever $r(s) \in U_0^{(1)}$, $\eta \in B_1$, $0 < |h| \leq \epsilon'_1$ and $r(s + h\,\eta) \in U_0^{(1)}$.

In this way we have completed the first step in our recursive construction. Whether we need to make more steps or not depends on which of the following two alternatives takes place.

Alternative 1.A. There exist an open cylinder V contained in $U_0^{(1)}$ and a constant $\delta_1 \in (0, \delta_0)$ such that $M_{\xi_1}^{(\delta)}(V) \supset V$ for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_1]$.

Alternative 1.B. Alternative 1.A does not hold.

In the case of Alternative 1.A we simply terminate the recursive construction at this stage replacing $U_0^{(1)}$ by V.

If Alternative 1.B takes place, we need to make at least one more step in the inductive construction.

Inductive Step. Suppose that for some $j \geq 1$ we have constructed open cylinders $U_0^{(j)} \subset \ldots \subset U_0^{(1)}$ contained in U'_0, and for each $\ell = 1, \ldots, j$, an integer $m_\ell \geq 1$ and a vector $\xi_\ell \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ such that the conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) in the lemma are fulfilled with j_0 replaced by j.

There are two alternatives again.

Alternative j.A. There exist an open cylinder V contained in $U_0^{(j)}$ and $\delta_j \in (0, \delta_{j-1})$ such that

$$M_{\xi_1}^{(\delta)}(V) \cup M_{\xi_2}^{(\delta)}(V) \cup \ldots \cup M_{\xi_j}^{(\delta)}(V) \supset V \quad , \quad \delta \in (0, \delta_j] \;.$$

Alternative j.B. Alternative j.A does not hold.

In the case of Alternative j.A we terminate the recursive construction at this stage replacing $U_0^{(j)}$ by V.

Next, assume that Alternative j.B takes place. One then needs to complete

Step j+1. Construct an open cylinder $U_0^{(j+1)}$ contained in $U_0^{(j)}$, an integer $m_{j+1} \geq 1$ and a unit vector $\xi_{j+1} \in E^u(z_0)$ such that the conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) in the lemma are fulfilled with j_0 replaced by $j + 1$.

Given V and $\delta > 0$, set

$$A_\delta(V) = M_{\xi_1}^{(\delta)}(V) \cup M_{\xi_2}^{(\delta)}(V) \cup \ldots \cup M_{\xi_j}^{(\delta)}(V) \; .$$

It follows from Alternative j.B that for any open cylinder V contained in $U_0^{(j)}$ we have $V \setminus A_\delta(V) \neq \emptyset$ for arbitrarily small δ.

Notice that, since there are only countably many cylinders in $U_0^{(j)}$, there exists a decreasing sequence $\delta_j = \mu_0 > \mu_1 > \mu_2 > \ldots > \mu_k > \ldots$ converging to zero such that for any cylinder $\mathcal{C}$ in $U_0^{(j)}$ we have $\operatorname{diam}(\mathcal{C}) = \mu_k$ for some k. Then for any $V \subset U_0^{(j)}$ and any $m \geq 1$ we have $A_\delta(V) = A_{\mu_m}(V)$ whenever $\mu_m \leq \delta < \mu_{m-1}$.

Let $V = U_0^{(j)}$ and for any $m \geq 1$ consider the compact subset $F_m = \bigcap_{k \geq m} A_{\mu_k}(V)$ of $\overline{V}$. Clearly $F_{m'} \subset F_m$ whenever $m' < m$. We claim that $\operatorname{Int}_\Lambda(F_m) = \emptyset$ for all $m \geq 1$. Indeed, assume that $\operatorname{Int}_\Lambda(F_m) \neq \emptyset$ for some $m' \geq 1$; then there exists a non-empty open cylinder W contained in $F_{m'}$. There exists $k' \geq 1$ with $\mu_{k'} = \operatorname{diam}(W)$. Setting $m = \max\{m', k'\} + 1$, we have $W \subset F_m$. Moreover, for $0 < \delta \leq \mu_m$ we have

$$M_{\xi_i}^{(\delta)}(V) \cap W \subset M_{\xi_i}^{(\delta)}(W) \quad , \quad i = 1, \ldots, j \; . \tag{4.5}$$

Consequently, for all $0 < \delta \leq \mu_m$ we have $A_\delta(V) \cap W \subset A_\delta(W)$. Now $W \subset F_m$ implies $W = F_m \cap W = \bigcap_{k \geq m} A_{\mu_k}(V) \cap W \subset \bigcap_{k \geq m} A_{\mu_k}(W)$. Thus, $W \subset A_{\mu_k}(W)$ for all $k \geq m$, which means that $W \subset A_\delta(W)$ for all $0 < \delta \leq \mu_m$. This is a contradiction with Alternative j.B.

Hence $\operatorname{Int}_\Lambda(F_m) = \emptyset$ for all $m \geq 1$. Thus, $U_0^{(j)} \setminus F_m$ are open and dense subsets of $U_0^{(j)}$, so $G = \cap_{m=1}^\infty (U_0^{(j)} \setminus F_m)$ is a residual (even a G_δ) subset of $U_0^{(j)}$. The properties of $\widehat{U}$ now imply $G \cap \widehat{U} \neq \emptyset$.

Choose an arbitrary $\hat{z} \in G \cap \widehat{U}$ and fix it. Given any $m \geq 1$, we have $\hat{z} \notin F_m$, so there exists $\mu'_m \in (0, \mu_m]$ with $\hat{z} \notin A_{\mu'_m}(V)$, i.e. $\hat{z} \notin \cup_{\ell=1}^j M_{\xi_\ell}^{(\mu'_m)}(V)$. So, if $\mathcal{C}^{(m)}$ is the maximal cylinder in $\overline{V}$ with $\operatorname{diam}(\mathcal{C}^{(m)}) \leq \mu'_m$ such that $\hat{z} \in \mathcal{C}^{(m)}$, then $\mathcal{C}^{(m)} \notin \mathcal{S}_{\xi_\ell}$ for any $\ell = 1, \ldots, j$.

Fix $m \geq 1$ for a moment, and let $u_m, v_m \in \mathcal{C}^{(m)}$ be such that $d(u_m, v_m) = \operatorname{diam}(\mathcal{C}^{(m)})$. Since $\hat{z} \in \mathcal{C}^{(m)}$, we may assume $d(u_m, \hat{z}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{diam}(\mathcal{C}^{(m)})$. Then $\left\langle \frac{r^{-1}(u_m) - r^{-1}(\hat{z})}{\|r^{-1}(u_m) - r^{-1}(\hat{z})\|} \, , \, \xi_\ell \right\rangle < \theta_1$ for all $\ell = 1, \ldots, j$, since $\mathcal{C}^{(m)} \notin \mathcal{S}_{\xi_\ell}$. Clearly, $u_m \to \hat{z}$ as $m \to \infty$. Choose a subsequence $\{u_{m_p}\}$ so that $\xi_{j+1} = \lim_{p \to \infty} \frac{r^{-1}(u_{m_p}) - r^{-1}(\hat{z})}{\|r^{-1}(u_{m_p}) - r^{-1}(\hat{z})\|} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ exists. Let $\hat{z} = r(\hat{s})$; then $\xi'_{j+1} = dr(\hat{s}) \cdot \xi_{j+1}$ is tangent to Λ at $\hat{z}$, and according to the above, $\langle \xi_{j+1}, \xi_\ell \rangle \leq \theta_1$ for all $\ell = 1, \ldots, j$.

Repeating the argument from the proof of (4.4) in Step 1, one derives that there exist $\tilde{z} = r(\tilde{s}) \in V = U_0^{(j)}$, $\tilde{y} \in W_{R_1}^s(\tilde{z}) \setminus U_1$, $\delta'_{j+1} \in (0, \hat{\delta}_j)$ and $\epsilon'_{j+1} > 0$ such that $|\Delta(r(s + h\,\eta), \pi_{\tilde{y}}(r(s)))| \geq \delta'_{j+1} |h|$ for all $r(s) \in V$ with $d(\tilde{z}, r(s)) < \epsilon'_{j+1}$, $\eta \in B_{j+1}$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|h| < \epsilon'_{j+1}$ and $r(s + h\eta) \in U_0^{(j)}$. We will assume that $\epsilon'_{j+1} > 0$ is so small that $B_U(\tilde{z}, \epsilon'_{j+1}) \subset V = U_0^{(j)}$.

Then, again as in Step 1, one constructs an open cylinder $U_0^{(j+1)} \subset U_0^{(j)}$ and contracting homeomorphisms $w_i^{(j+1)} : U_0^{(j+1)} \longrightarrow w_i^{(j+1)}(U_0^{(j+1)}) \subset \widetilde{V}_i^{(j+1)}$ $(i = 1, 2)$ with $\sigma^{m_{j+1}}(w_i^{(j+1)}(x)) = x$ for all $x \in U_0^{(j+1)}$ and such that $|I_{\eta,h}[\tau_{m_{j+1}}(w_2^{(j+1)}(r(s))) - \tau_{m_{j+1}}(w_1^{(j+1)}(r(s)))]| \geq \hat{\delta}_{j+1}$ for all $r(s) \in U_0^{(j+1)}$, $\eta \in B_{j+1}$, $0 < |h| \leq \hat{\delta}_{j+1}$ with $r(s + h\eta) \in U_0^{(j+1)}$. This completes Step $j+1$.

By the definition of j'_0, it is clear that this inductive procedure terminates after not more than j'_0 steps. That is, for some $j_0 \leq j'_0$ the Alternative $j_0.A$ holds, and then we terminate the construction at that step. ■

In what follows we use the objects constructed in Lemma 4.3. Set $\hat{\delta} = \min_{1 \leq j \leq j_0} \hat{\delta}_j$, $n_0 = \max_{1 \leq j \leq j_0} m_j$, and fix an arbitrary point $\hat{z}_0 \in U_0^{(j_0)} \cap \widehat{U}$.

Lemma 4.4. *There exist an integer $n_1 \geq 1$ and an open neighbourhood U_0 of $\hat{z}_0$ in $U_0^{(j_0)}$ such that U_0 is a finite union of open cylinders of length n_1, $\mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(U) = \sigma^{n_1}(U_0)$ and $\sigma^{n_1} : U_0 \longrightarrow \sigma^{n_1}(U_0)$ is a homeomorphism.*

Proof of Lemma 4.4. Let $U_0^{(j_0)} = C[\imath] = C[i_0, \ldots, i_m]$. By construction, $\hat{z}_0 \in \widehat{C}[\imath] \subset U_0^{(j_0)}$. For the matrix A we have $A^{M_0} > 0$ for some integer $M_0 \geq 1$ (see the beginning of the section), so for each $j = 1, \ldots, k$ there exists an admissible string $s^{(j)} = (i^{(j)}_{m+1}, \ldots, i^{(j)}_{m+M_0})$ such that $i^{(j)}_{m+M_0} = j$ and $A_{i_m i^{(j)}_{m+1}} = 1$. Fix an arbitrary string $s^{(j)}$ with this property. For the particular j' such that $\sigma^{m+M_0}(\hat{z}_0) \in U_{j'}$, choose $s^{(j')}$ in such a way that $\hat{z}_0 \in C[\imath; s^{(j')}]$.

Now set $n_1 = m + M_0$ and $U_0 = \cup_{j=1}^k \overset{\circ}{C} [\imath; s^{(j)}]$. Clearly, U_0 is an open subset of $U_0^{(j_0)}$ containing $\hat{z}_0$ and one shows easily that $\sigma^{n_1} : U_0 \longrightarrow \sigma^{n_1}(U_0)$ is a homeomorphism and $\mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(U) = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \sigma^{n_1}(\overset{\circ}{C} [\imath; s^{(j)}]) = \sigma^{n_1}(U_0)$. ■

Using the above lemma, **fix $n_1 > 0$ and an open neighbourhood U_0 of $\hat{z}_0$ in $U_0^{(j_0)}$** such that U_0 is a finite union of open cylinders of length n_1, $\mathcal{U} = \sigma^{n_1}(U_0) = \mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(U)$ and $\sigma^{n_1} : U_0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}$ is a homeomorphism. The inverse homeomorphism $\psi : \mathcal{U} \longrightarrow U_0$ is Lipschitz, so it has a Lipschitz extension

$$\psi : U \longrightarrow \overline{U_0} \text{ such that } \sigma^{n_1}(\psi(x)) = x \ , \ x \in \mathcal{U} \ . \tag{4.6}$$

Then $\tilde{r}(s) = \sigma^{n_1}(r(s))$, $s \in V_0$, where $V_0 = r^{-1}(U_0) \subset V_0'$, gives a Lipschitz parametrization of $\mathcal{U}$ with $\psi(\tilde{r}(s)) = r(s)$ for all $s \in V_0$. Finally, set

$$V_i^{(j)} = w_i^{(j)}(U_0) \subset \widetilde{V}_i^{(j)} \quad , \quad i = 1, 2 \ ; \ j = 1, \ldots, j_0 \ . \tag{4.7}$$

It follows from the choice of U_0, the properties of $w_i^{(j)}$ (see (i) in Lemma 4.3) and Proposition 3.1 that $V_i^{(j)}$ is a finite union of open cylinders of lengths $n_1 + m_j$.

The following two lemmas are proved essentially by using arguments from [D2] and Lemma 4.3 above. We omit most of the details.

Lemma 4.5. *For every $\delta'' > 0$ there exists an integer $n_2 > 0$ such that for any $m \geq n_0 + n_2$, any $j = 1, \ldots, j_0$ and $i = 1, 2$ there exist contracting maps $\tilde{v}_i^{(j)} : V_i^{(j)} \longrightarrow U$ with $\sigma^{m-m_j}(\tilde{v}_i^{(j)}(w)) = w$ for all $w \in V_i^{(j)}$ such that*

$$\mathrm{Lip}(\tau_{m-m_j} \circ \tilde{v}_i^{(j)}) \leq \delta'' \quad \text{on} \quad V_i^{(j)} \ , \tag{4.8}$$

$\tilde{v}_i^{(j)}(V_i^{(j)})$ is a finite union of open cylinders of length $n_1 + m$ and $\overline{\tilde{v}_i^{(j)}(V_i^{(j)})} \bigcap \overline{\tilde{v}_{i'}^{(j')}(V_{i'}^{(j')})} = \emptyset$ whenever $(i, j) \neq (i', j')$. ■

Set $\delta'' = \frac{c_0 \hat{\delta}}{8}$, **fix $n_2 = n_2(\delta'') > 0$ with the properties listed in Lemma 4.5**, and denote $N_0 = n_0 + n_1 + n_2$.

Lemma 4.6. *For any integer $N \geq N_0$ there exist Lipschitz maps $v_1^{(j)}, v_2^{(j)} : U \longrightarrow U$ ($j = 1, \ldots, j_0$) such that $\sigma^N(v_i^{(j)}(x)) = x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{U}$, $v_i^{(j)}(\mathcal{U})$ is a finite union of open cylinders of length N, and $I_{\eta,h}[\tau_N(v_2^{(j)}(\tilde{r}(s))) - \tau_N(v_1^{(j)}(\tilde{r}(s)))] \geq \frac{\hat{\delta}}{2}$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, j_0$, $s \in V_0$, $0 < |h| \leq \hat{\delta}$ and $\eta \in B_j$ so that both s and $s + h\,\eta$ are in $r^{-1}(U_0 \cap \Lambda) \subset V_0$. Moreover we can choose the maps $v_1^{(j)}, v_2^{(j)}$ in such a way that $v_i^{(j)}(U) \bigcap v_{i'}^{(j')}(U) = \emptyset$ whenever $(i, j) \neq (i', j')$.*

Proof of Lemma 4.6. Let $N \geq N_0$. Then $m = N - n_1 \geq n_0 + n_2$, so by Lemma 4.5 for any $j = 1, \ldots, j_0$ and any $i = 1, 2$ there exists a contracting homeomorphism

$$\tilde{v}_i^{(j)} : V_i^{(j)} \longrightarrow \tilde{v}_i^{(j)}(V_i^{(j)}) \subset U \text{ with } \sigma^{N-m_j-n_1}(\tilde{v}_i^{(j)}(w)) = w \ , \ w \in V_i^{(j)} \ , \tag{4.9}$$

such that (4.8) holds with $m = N - n_1$ and δ'' as above. Moreover, we can choose the maps $\tilde{v}_i^{(j)}$ so that $\overline{\tilde{v}_i^{(j)}(V_i^{(j)})} \bigcap \overline{\tilde{v}_{i'}^{(j')}(V_{i'}^{(j')})} = \emptyset$ whenever $(i, j) \neq (i', j')$. Now define Lipschitz maps

$$v_i^{(j)} : U \longrightarrow U \quad \text{such that} \quad v_i^{(j)}(x) = \tilde{v}_i^{(j)}(w_i^{(j)}(\psi(x))) \ , \ x \in \mathcal{U} \ . \tag{4.10}$$

It follows immediately from the above that $v_i^{(j)}(U) \cap v_{i'}^{(j')}(U) = \emptyset$ whenever $(i, j) \neq (i', j')$, while Proposition 3.1 shows that each $v_i^{(j)}(\mathcal{U})$ is a finite union of open cylinders of length N.

Moreover, for any $x \in \mathcal{U}$, according to (i) in Lemma 4.3, (4.10) and (4.9), we have $\sigma^{N-n_1}(v_i^{(j)}(x)) = \sigma^{m_j}(\sigma^{N-m_j-n_1}(v_i^{(j)}(x))) = \sigma^{m_j}(w_i^{(j)}(\psi(x))) = \psi(x)$, which is the same for all j and i. Consequently, $\sigma^p(v_1^{(j)}(x)) = \sigma^p(v_2^{(j)}(x))$ for all $p \geq N - n_1$ and $x \in \mathcal{U}$. Thus, $\tau_N(v_2^{(j)}(x)) - \tau_N(v_1^{(j)}(x)) = \tau_{N-n_1}(v_2^{(j)}(x)) - \tau_{N-n_1}(v_1^{(j)}(x))$ for $x \in \mathcal{U}$, and given $\eta \in B_j$ and $h > 0$, we have

$$I_{\eta,h}\left[\tau_N(v_2^{(j)}(\tilde{r}(s))) - \tau_N(v_1^{(j)}(\tilde{r}(s)))\right] = I_{\eta,h}\left[\tau_{N-n_1}(\tilde{v}_2^{(j)}(w_2^{(j)}(r(s)))) - \tau_{N-n_1}(\tilde{v}_1^{(j)}(w_1^{(j)}(r(s))))\right] \ .$$

Now Lemma 4.3(ii), (4.9), (4.2) and (4.8) imply $\left| I_{\eta,h}\left[\tau_N(v_2^{(j)}(\tilde{r}(s))) - \tau_N(v_1^{(j)}(\tilde{r}(s)))\right] \right| \geq \frac{\hat{\delta}}{2}$. ■

5 Dolgopyat operators

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1.

Throughout we assume that Λ is a basic set for a C^2 Axiom A flow $\phi_t : M \longrightarrow M$ satisfying the condition (LNIC) which has regular distortion along unstable manifolds over Λ and uniformly Lipschitz local stable holonomy maps. We use the notation from Sect. 2, in particular the fixed real-valued function $f \in C^{\text{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$, the function $g = f - P\,\tau$, where $P \in \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\text{Pr}_\sigma(g) = 0$, and the σ-invariant probability measure ν on Λ such that $L^*_{f^{(0)}}\nu = \nu$.

The central point here is to prove the L^1-contraction property of the normalized operator L_{ab} with respect to the Gibbs measure ν and the norm $\|h\|_{\text{Lip},b}$.

Theorem 5.1. *There exist a positive integer N and constants $\hat{\rho} \in (0, 1)$ and $a_0 > 0$ such that for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|a| \leq a_0$ and $|b| \geq 1/a_0$ and any $h \in C^{\text{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$ with $\|h\|_{\text{Lip},b} \leq 1$ we have $\displaystyle\int_U |L_{ab}^{Nm} h|^2 \, d\nu \leq \hat{\rho}^m$ for every positive integer m.*

Theorem 1.1 is derived from the above in the same way as in [D2] (see also the proof of Corollary 3.3(a) in [St1]). Indeed, the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 are exactly the ones we have in this section.

Define a *new metric* D on $\widehat{U}$ by

$$D(x, y) = \min\{\text{diam}(\mathcal{C}) : x, y \in \mathcal{C} \ , \ \mathcal{C} \text{ a cylinder contained in } U_i\}$$

if $x, y \in U_i$ for some $i = 1, \ldots, k$, and $D(x, y) = 1$ otherwise. Recall that $\text{diam}(U_i) < 1$ for all i by the choice of the Markov family.

The proof of the following lemma is straightforward.

Lemma 5.2. *(a) D is a metric on $\widehat{U}$, and if $x, y \in \widehat{U}_i$ for some i, then $d(x,y) \leq D(x,y)$.*

(b) *For any cylinder $\mathcal{C}$ in U the characteristic function $\chi_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$ of $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ on $\widehat{U}$ is Lipschitz with respect to D and* $\mathrm{Lip}_D(\chi_{\mathcal{C}}) \leq 1/\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C})$. ■

We will denote by $C_D^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$ the *space of all Lipschitz functions $h : \widehat{U} \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ with respect to the metric D* on $\widehat{U}$ and by $\mathrm{Lip}_D(h)$ the *Lipschitz constant* of h with respect to D.

Given $A > 0$, denote by $K_A(\widehat{U})$ *the set of all functions* $h \in C_D^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$ such that $h > 0$ and $\frac{|h(u)-h(u')|}{h(u')} \leq A\, D(u,u')$ for all $u, u' \in \widehat{U}$ that belong to the same $\widehat{U}_i$ for some $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Notice that $h \in K_A(\widehat{U})$ implies $|\ln h(u) - \ln h(v)| \leq A\ D(u,v)$ and therefore $e^{-A\ D(u,v)} \leq \frac{h(u)}{h(v)} \leq e^{A\ D(u,v)}$ for all $u, v \in \widehat{U}_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

Theorem 5.1 is derived from the following lemma which is the analogue of Lemma 10$''$ in [D2]. It should be stressed that replacing the standard metric[9] d by the metric D is significant here. In fact, in this generality it is not clear at all whether the statements in the lemma remain true with D replaced by d.

Lemma 5.3. *There exist a positive integer N and constants $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}(N) \in (0,1)$, $a_0 = a_0(N) > 0$, $b_0 = b_0(N) > 0$ and $E \geq 1$ such that for every $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|a| \leq a_0$, $|b| \geq b_0$, there exists a finite family $\{\mathcal{N}_J\}_{J \in \mathsf{J}}$ of operators $\mathcal{N}_J = \mathcal{N}_J(a,b) : C_D^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U}) \longrightarrow C_D^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$, where $\mathsf{J} = \mathsf{J}(\mathsf{a},\mathsf{b})$ is a finite set depending on a and b, with the following properties:*

(a) *The operators $\mathcal{N}_J$ preserve the cone $K_{E|b|}(\widehat{U})$;*

(b) *For all $H \in K_{E|b|}(\widehat{U})$ and $J \in \mathsf{J}$ we have $\int_{\widehat{U}} (\mathcal{N}_J H)^2\, d\nu \leq \hat{\rho} \int_{\widehat{U}} H^2\, d\nu$.*

(c) *If $h, H \in C_D^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$ are such that $H \in K_{E|b|}(\widehat{U})$, $|h(u)| \leq H(u)$ for all $u \in \widehat{U}$ and $|h(u) - h(u')| \leq E|b| H(u')\, D(u,u')$ whenever $u, u' \in \widehat{U}_i$ for some $i = 1, \ldots, k$, then there exists $J \in \mathsf{J}$ such that $|L_{ab}^N h(u)| \leq (\mathcal{N}_J H)(u)$ for all $u \in \widehat{U}$ and*

$$|(L_{ab}^N h)(u) - (L_{ab}^N h)(u')| \leq E|b| (\mathcal{N}_J H)(u')\, D(u,u')$$

whenever $u, u' \in \widehat{U}_i$ for some $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

The remainder of this section if devoted to the proof of Lemma 5.3. We begin with a technical lemma containing two specific versions of Lasota-Yorke type of inequalities. Its proof is given in Appendix A. Here we use the constants $a_0' > 0$, $T > 0$ and $\gamma_1 > \gamma > 1$ from Sect. 2.

Lemma 5.4. *There exists a constant $A_0 > 0$ such that for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|a| \leq a_0'$ the following hold:*

(a) *If $H \in K_B(\widehat{U})$ for some $B > 0$, then $\frac{|(\mathcal{M}_a^m H)(u) - (\mathcal{M}_a^m H)(u')|}{(\mathcal{M}_a^m H)(u')} \leq A_0 \left[\frac{B}{\gamma^m} + \frac{T}{\gamma - 1}\right] D(u,u')$ for all $m \geq 1$ and all $u, u' \in U_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$.*

(b) *If the functions h and H on $\widehat{U}$ and $B > 0$ are such that $H > 0$ on $\widehat{U}$ and $|h(v) - h(v')| \leq B\, H(v')\, D(v,v')$ for any $v, v' \in \widehat{U}_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$, then for any integer $m \geq 1$ and any $b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|b| \geq 1$ we have $|L_{ab}^m h(u) - L_{ab}^m h(u')| \leq A_0 \left[\frac{B}{\gamma^m} (\mathcal{M}_a^m H)(u') + |b|\, (\mathcal{M}_a^m |h|)(u')\right] D(u,u')$ whenever $u, u' \in \widehat{U}_i$ for some $i = 1, \ldots, k$.*

---

[9] In fact, it is not clear at all whether a similar lemma will be true for general basic sets on manifolds of arbitrary dimension with the metric d in the place of D.

Throughout we will frequently use the objects constructed in the previous section, notably $\hat{\delta} > 0$, the integers n_0, $n_1 \geq p_1$ and n_2, the sets $U_0 \subset U_1$ and $\mathcal{U} = \sigma^{n_1}(U_0) = \mathrm{Int}_\Lambda(U)$, U_0 being a finite union of open cylinders of length n_1, the maps $w_i^{(j)} : U_0 \longrightarrow V_i^{(j)}$ defined in Lemma 4.3, etc. We will also use the constants $\rho \in (0,1)$ and $p_0 \geq 1$ from Lemma 3.3.

We will now impose certain condition on the numbers N, ϵ_1, b and μ that will be used throughout. Where these conditions come from will become clear later on.

Set $E = \max\left\{4A_0 \; , \; \frac{2A_0\, T}{\gamma - 1} \right\}$, where $A_0 \geq 1$ is the constant from Lemma 5.4, **fix an integer** $N > N_0 = n_0 + n_1 + n_2$ such that

$$\gamma^N \geq \max\left\{ 6A_0 \; , \; \frac{200\, \gamma_1^{n_1}\, A_0}{c_0^2} \; , \; \frac{512\, \gamma^{n_1}\, E}{c_0\, \hat{\delta}\, \rho} \right\} , \tag{5.1}$$

and define $\tilde{v}_i^{(j)}$ and $v_i^{(j)}$ by (4.10) and (4.9). Then the conclusion of Lemma 4.6 holds. In particular,

$$v_i^{(\ell)}(U) \cap v_{i'}^{(\ell')}(U) = \emptyset \quad , \quad (i,\ell) \neq (i',\ell') . \tag{5.2}$$

Since U_0 is a finite union of open cylinders contained in $U_0^{(j_0)}$ (see Lemma 4.4 and the text thereafter), it follows from Lemma 4.3 that there exist a constant $\delta' = \delta'(U_0) \in (0, \delta_0)$ such that

$$M_{\xi_1}^{(\delta)}(U_0) \cup \ldots \cup M_{\xi_{j_0}}^{(\delta)}(U_0) \supset U_0 \quad , \quad \delta \in (0, \delta'] , \tag{5.3}$$

Fix δ' with this property. Set

$$\epsilon_1 = \min\left\{ \frac{1}{32C_0} \; , \; c_1 \; , \; \frac{1}{4E} \; , \; \frac{1}{\hat{\delta}\, \rho^{p_0+2}} \; , \; \frac{c_0 r_0}{\gamma_1^{n_1}} \; , \; \frac{c_0^2(\gamma-1)}{16T\gamma_1^{n_1}} \right\} , \tag{5.4}$$

and let $b \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $|b| \geq 1$ and

$$\frac{\epsilon_1}{|b|} \leq \delta' . \tag{5.5}$$

Let $\mathcal{C}_j = \mathcal{C}_j^{(\epsilon_1/|b|)}$ $(1 \leq j \leq p)$ be the family of *maximal closed cylinders* contained in $\overline{U_0}$ with $\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}_j) \leq \frac{\epsilon_1}{|b|}$ such that $U_0 \subset \cup_{j=1}^p \mathcal{C}_j$ and $\overline{U_0} = \cup_{j=1}^p \mathcal{C}_j$ (see Definitions 4.2). It follows from (5.5), (5.4) and Lemma 3.2, that the length of each $\mathcal{C}_j$ is not less than n_1, so σ^{n_1} is expanding on $\mathcal{C}_j$. Moreover, Proposition 3.3(a) implies that $\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}_j) \geq \rho\, \frac{\epsilon_1}{|b|}$ for all j, so

$$\rho\, \frac{\epsilon_1}{|b|} \leq \mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}_j) \leq \frac{\epsilon_1}{|b|} \quad , \quad 1 \leq j \leq p . \tag{5.6}$$

We are also going to use the numbers $0 < \theta_0 < \theta_1 < 1$ from Sect. 4. Fix an integer $q_0 \geq 1$ such that

$$\theta_0 < \theta_1 - 32\, \rho^{q_0 - 1} . \tag{5.7}$$

Next, let $\mathcal{D}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{D}_q$ be the list of all closed cylinders contained in $\overline{U_0}$ that are *subcylinders of co-length* $p_0\, q_0$ of some $\mathcal{C}_j$ $(1 \leq j \leq p)$. That is, if k_j is the length of $\mathcal{C}_j$, we consider the subcylinders of length $k_j + p_0\, q_0$ of $\mathcal{C}_j$, and we do this for any $j = 1, \ldots, p$. Then $\overline{U_0} = \mathcal{C}_1 \cup \ldots \cup \mathcal{C}_p = \mathcal{D}_1 \cup \ldots \cup \mathcal{D}_q$. Moreover, it follows from the properties of $\mathcal{C}_j$ and Proposition 3.3 that

$$\rho^{p_0\, q_0 + 1} \cdot \frac{\epsilon_1}{|b|} \leq \mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{D}_j) \leq \rho^{q_0} \cdot \frac{\epsilon_1}{|b|} \quad , \quad 1 \leq j \leq q . \tag{5.8}$$

Given $j = 1, \ldots, q$, $\ell = 1, \ldots, j_0$ and $i = 1, 2$, set

$$Y_{i,j}^{(\ell)} = w_i^{(\ell)}(\mathcal{D}_j) \quad , \quad Z_j = \sigma^{n_1}(\mathcal{D}_j) \quad , \quad X_{i,j}^{(\ell)} = \{ v_i^{(\ell)}(u) : u \in Z_j \} ,$$

$\widehat{Z}_j = Z_j \cap \widehat{U}$, $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_j = \mathcal{D}_j \cap \widehat{U}$, $\widehat{Y}_{i,j}^{(\ell)} = Y_{i,j}^{(\ell)} \cap \widehat{U}$ and $\widehat{X}_{i,j}^{(\ell)} = X_{i,j}^{(\ell)} \cap \widehat{U}$. See the diagram below.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{U} \arrow[r, shift left, "\psi"] & U_0 \arrow[l, shift left, "\sigma^{n_1}"] \arrow[r, shift left, "w_i^{(\ell)}"] & V_i^{(\ell)} \arrow[l, shift left, "\sigma^{m_\ell}"] \arrow[r, shift left, "\tilde{v}_i^{(\ell)}"] & \tilde{v}_i^{(\ell)}(V_i^{(\ell)}) \subset U_1 \arrow[l, shift left, "\sigma^{N-m_\ell-n_1}"] \\
\bigcup & \bigcup & \bigcup & \bigcup \\
\widehat{Z}_j = \sigma^{n_1}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_j) \arrow[r, "\psi"] & \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_j \arrow[r, "w_i^{(\ell)}"] & \widehat{Y}_{i,j}^{(\ell)} \arrow[r, "\tilde{v}_i^{(\ell)}"] & \widehat{X}_{i,j}^{(\ell)}
\end{tikzcd}$$

It then follows that $\mathcal{D}_j = \psi(Z_j)$, $X_{i,j}^{(\ell)} = \tilde{v}_i^{(\ell)}(Y_{i,j}^{(\ell)})$, and $U = \cup_{j=1}^{q} Z_j$. Moreover, by Proposition 3.1, $Y_{i,j}^{(\ell)}$ and $X_{i,j}^{(\ell)}$ are cylinders.

Remark 5.5. It follows from (5.2) that $\widehat{X}_{i,j}^{(\ell)} \cap \widehat{X}_{i',j'}^{(\ell')} = \emptyset$ whenever $(i,j,\ell) \neq (i',j',\ell')$.

By Lemma 5.2(b), the *characteristic function* $\eta_{i,j}^{(\ell)} = \chi_{\widehat{X}_{i,j}^{(\ell)}} : \widehat{U} \longrightarrow [0,1]$ of $\widehat{X}_{i,j}^{(\ell)}$ belongs to $C_D^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$ and $\mathrm{Lip}_D(\eta_{i,j}^{(\ell)}) \leq 1/\mathrm{diam}(X_{i,j}^{(\ell)})$. Since $\sigma^{N-n_1}(\widehat{X}_{i,j}^{(\ell)}) = \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_j$ and $\sigma^{N-n_1} : \widehat{X}_{i,j}^{(\ell)} \longrightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_j$ is expanding (according to the constructions of the maps $w_i^{(\ell)}$ and $\tilde{v}_i^{(\ell)}$ (see Sect. 4), it follows from (2.1) that $\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{D}_j) \leq \frac{\gamma_1^{N-n_1}}{c_0}\,\mathrm{diam}(X_{i,j}^{(\ell)}) \leq \frac{\gamma_1^N}{c_0}\,\mathrm{diam}(X_{i,j}^{(\ell)})$. Combining this with (5.8) gives

$$\mathrm{diam}(X_{i,j}^{(\ell)}) \geq \frac{c_0\,\rho^{p_0\,q_0+1}}{\gamma_1^N} \cdot \frac{\epsilon_1}{|b|} \tag{5.9}$$

for all $i = 1,2$, $j = 1,\dots,q$ and $\ell = 1,\dots,j_0$.

Let J be a *subset of the set* $\Xi = \Xi(a,b) = \{\ (i,j,\ell)\ :\ 1 \leq i \leq 2\ ,\ 1 \leq j \leq q\ ,\ 1 \leq \ell \leq j_0\ \}$. Set

$$\mu = \mu(N) = \min\left\{ \frac{1}{4}\ ,\ \frac{c_0\,\rho^{p_0 q_0+2}\,\epsilon_1}{4\,\gamma_1^N}\ ,\ \frac{1}{4\,e^{2TN}}\,\sin^2\left(\frac{\hat{\delta}\,\rho\,\epsilon_1}{256}\right) \right\}\ , \tag{5.10}$$

and define the function $\beta = \beta_J : \widehat{U} \longrightarrow [0,1]$ by $\beta = 1 - \mu \sum_{(i,j,\ell)\in J} \eta_{i,j}^{(\ell)}$. Clearly $\beta \in C_D^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$ and $1 - \mu \leq \beta(u) \leq 1$ for any $u \in \widehat{U}$. Using Remark 5.5, Lemma 5.2(b) and (5.9) one derives that

$$\mathrm{Lip}_D(\beta) \leq \Gamma = \frac{2\mu\,\gamma_1^N}{c_0\,\rho^{p_0 q_0+2}} \cdot \frac{|b|}{\epsilon_1}\ . \tag{5.11}$$

Next, define *the operator* $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_J(a,b) : C_D^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U}) \longrightarrow C_D^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$ by $(\mathcal{N}h) = \big(\mathcal{M}_a^N(\beta_J \cdot h)\big)$.

The following lemma contains statements similar to Proposition 6 and Lemma 11 in [D2] and by means of Lemma 5.4 their proofs are also very similar, so we omit them.

Lemma 5.6. *Under the above conditions for N and μ the following hold :*

(a) *$\mathcal{N}h \in K_{E|b|}(\widehat{U})$ for any $h \in K_{E|b|}(\widehat{U})$;*

(b) *If $h \in C_D^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$ and $H \in K_{E|b|}(\widehat{U})$ are such that $|h| \leq H$ in $\widehat{U}$ and $|h(v) - h(v')| \leq E|b|H(v')\,D(v,v')$ for any $v, v' \in U_j$, $j = 1,\dots,k$, then for any $i = 1,\dots,k$ and any $u, u' \in \widehat{U}_i$ we have $|(L_{ab}^N\,h)(u) - (L_{ab}^N h)(u')| \leq E|b|(\mathcal{N}\,H)(u')\,D(u,u')$.*

Definition. Given $t > 0$ and $m > 0$, a subset W of $\widehat{U}$ will be called *(t,m)-dense* in $\widehat{U}$ if for every $u \in \widehat{U}$ there exist a cylinder $\mathcal{C}$ containing u with $\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}) \leq mt$ and a cylinder $\mathcal{C}'$ with $\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}') \geq t$ such that $\hat{\mathcal{C}}' \subset W \cap \mathcal{C}$.

Below we use the constants c_1, c_2 from (3.1) and $\|g\|_0 = \sup_{u\in\widehat{U}} |g(u)|$.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $A > 0$, $m \geq 1$ and let $\epsilon = \epsilon(m,A) = \dfrac{d_m}{e^{m^2A^2}}$, where $d_m = \frac{c_1}{c_2}\, e^{-p_0\, \|g\|_0 \left(\frac{\ln m}{|\ln \rho|}+1\right)}$. Then for any $t > 0$, any (t,m)-dense subset W of $\widehat{U}$ and any $H \in K_{A/t}(\widehat{U})$, we have*

$$\int_W H^2 \, d\nu \geq \epsilon \int_{\widehat{U}} H^2 \, d\nu \, .$$

Proof of Lemma 5.7. Let $t > 0$, let W be a (t,m)-dense subset of $\widehat{U}$ and let $H \in K_{A/t}(\widehat{U})$. Let $\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_s$ be the maximal cylinders in U with $\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{B}_j) \leq mt$ for any $j = 1, \ldots, s$. Then $\cup_{j=1}^s \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_j = \widehat{U}$, and so $\sum_{j=1}^s \nu(\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_j) = 1$. Setting $m_j = \inf_{u\in\mathcal{B}_j} H(u)$ and $M_j = \sup_{u\in\mathcal{B}_j} H(u)$, it then follows from $H \in K_{A/t}(\widehat{U})$ that $\frac{M_j}{m_j} \leq e^{\frac{Amt}{t}} = e^{Am}$. Thus, $H(u) \geq m_j \geq M_j e^{-Am}$ for all $u \in \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_j$.

For each $j = 1, \ldots, s$ choose an arbitrary point $u_j \in \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_j$. Since W is (t,m)-dense in $\widehat{U}$, there exists a subcylinder $\mathcal{B}'_j$ of $\mathcal{B}_j$ such that $\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{B}'_j) \geq t$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}'_j \subset W \cap \mathcal{B}_j$. If q_j is the co-length of $\mathcal{B}'_j$ in $\mathcal{B}_j$, and $q_j = r_j p_0 + s_j$ for some integers $r_j \geq 0$, $0 \leq s_j < p_0$, by Proposition 3.3(b) we have $t \leq \mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{B}'_j) \leq \rho^{r_j}\, \mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{B}_j) \leq \rho^{r_j}\, mt$, so $\rho^{r_j} \geq 1/m$, i.e. $r_j \leq \ln m/|\ln\rho|$. Thus, $q_j < p_0(r_j+1) \leq p_0\,(\ln m/|\ln\rho| + 1)$. If p_j is the length of the cylinder $\mathcal{B}_j$ and $p'_j = p_j + q_j$ that of $\mathcal{B}'_j$, (3.1) gives $\frac{\nu(\mathcal{B}'_j)}{\nu(\mathcal{B}_j)} \geq \frac{c_1}{c_2}\, e^{-q_j\, \|g\|_0} \geq d_m$. Hence $\nu(\mathcal{B}'_j) \geq d_m\, \nu(\mathcal{B}_j)$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, s$.

It now follows that $\nu(W \cap \mathcal{B}_j) \geq \nu(\mathcal{B}'_j) \geq d_m\, \nu(\mathcal{B}_j)$ for any j, so

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_W H^2(u)\, d\nu(u) &= \sum_{j=1}^s \int_{W\cap\mathcal{B}_j} H^2(u)\, d\nu(u) \geq \sum_{j=1}^s M_j^2 e^{-A^2m^2} \nu(W \cap \mathcal{B}_j) \\
&\geq e^{-A^2m^2} \sum_{j=1}^s M_j^2\, d_m \nu(\mathcal{B}_j) \geq \frac{d_m}{e^{A^2m^2}} \int_{\widehat{U}} H^2(u)\, d\nu(u) = \epsilon \int_{\widehat{U}} H^2(u)\, d\nu(u) \, .
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the assertion. ■

Definitions. We will say that the cylinders $\mathcal{D}_j$ and $\mathcal{D}_{j'}$ are *adjacent* if they are subcylinders of the same $\mathcal{C}_i$ for some i. If $\mathcal{D}_j, \mathcal{D}_{j'} \subset \mathcal{C}_i$ and for some $\ell = 1, \ldots, j_0$ there exist $u \in \mathcal{D}_j$ and $v \in \mathcal{D}_{j'}$ such that $d(u,v) \geq \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}_i)$ and $\left\langle \frac{r^{-1}(v)-r^{-1}(u)}{\|r^{-1}(v)-r^{-1}(u)\|} \, , \, \xi_\ell \right\rangle \geq \theta_1$ we will say that $\mathcal{D}_j$ and $\mathcal{D}_{j'}$ are *ξ_ℓ-separable in $\mathcal{C}_i$*.

Finally, a subset J of Ξ will be called *dense* if for any $j = 1, \ldots, q$ there exists $(i, j', \ell) \in J$ such that $\mathcal{D}_j$ and $\mathcal{D}_{j'}$ are adjacent. Denote by $\mathsf{J} = \mathsf{J}(\mathsf{a}, \mathsf{b})$ the *set of all dense subsets* J of Ξ.

Lemma 5.8. *Given the number N, there exist $\epsilon_2 = \epsilon_2(N) \in (0,1)$ and $a_0 = a_0(N) > 0$ such that $\int_{\widehat{U}} (\mathcal{N}H)^2 d\nu \leq (1-\epsilon_2) \int_{\widehat{U}} H^2 d\nu$ whenever $|\mathsf{a}| \leq a_0$, J is dense and $H \in K_{E|\mathsf{b}|}(\widehat{U})$. More precisely, we can take $\epsilon_2 = \frac{\epsilon'\,\mu\, e^{-NT}}{4}$ and $a_0 = \min\left\{a'_0, \frac{1}{C_0\, N}\, \ln\left(1 + \frac{\epsilon'\,\mu\, e^{-NT}}{4}\right)\right\}$, where $\epsilon' = \frac{d_{m'}}{e^{(E\,\gamma_1^{n_1}\,\epsilon_1/c_0)^2}}$ and $m' = \frac{\gamma_1^{n_1}}{c_0^2\, \gamma^{n_1}\, \rho^{p_0\, q_0+1}}$.*

Proof of Lemma 5.8. The definition of $\mathcal{N}$ and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality imply

$$(\mathcal{N}H)^2(u) = (\mathcal{M}_a^N(\beta H))^2(u) \le (\mathcal{M}_a^N \beta^2)(u) \cdot (\mathcal{M}_a^N H^2)(u) \le (\mathcal{M}_a^N H^2)(u) \tag{5.12}$$

for all $u \in \widehat{U}$.

Denote $W = \cup_{(i,j,\ell)\in J} \widehat{Z}_j$. Then $u \in W$ means that there exists $(i,j,\ell) \in J$ with $v_i^{(\ell)}(u) \in X_{i,j}^{(\ell)}$, and so $\beta(v_i^{(\ell)}(u)) = 1 - \mu$.

We will now show that W is (t, m')-dense in $\widehat{U}$, where $t = c_0\, \gamma^{n_1}\, \rho^{p_0\, q_0+1} \cdot \frac{\epsilon_1}{|b|}$ and m' is as above. Let $u \in \widehat{U}$. Then $u \in \widehat{Z}_{j'}$ for some $j' = 1, \dots, q$, i.e. $\psi(u) \in \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{j'}$. Since J is dense, there exists $(i,j,\ell) \in J$ so that $\mathcal{D}_j$ and $\mathcal{D}_{j'}$ are adjacent, i.e. $\mathcal{D}_j$ and $\mathcal{D}_{j'}$ are contained in the same $\mathcal{C}_m$ for some m. Then $\mathcal{C} = \sigma^{n_1}(\mathcal{C}_m)$ is a cylinder containing $\sigma^{n_1}(\mathcal{D}_{j'}) = Z_{j'}$, so $u \in \mathcal{C}$. Moreover, $Z_j = \sigma^{n_1}(\mathcal{D}_j) \subset \mathcal{C}$, so $\widehat{Z}_j \subset W \cap \mathcal{C}$. Now (2.1), (5.6) and (5.8) yield $\mathrm{diam}(\widehat{Z}_j) \ge t$ and $\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}) \le m' t$, so W is (t, m')-dense in $\widehat{U}$.

Let $H \in K_{E|b|}(\widehat{U})$. Setting $A = E\, c_0\, \gamma^{n_1}\, \rho^{p_0\, q_0+1}\, \epsilon_1$, we have $H \in K_{\frac{A}{t}}(\widehat{U})$. Since $\epsilon' = \frac{d_{m'}}{e^{(m' A)^2}}$, it follows that $\epsilon' = \epsilon(m', A)$, the number defined in Lemma 5.7 with m replaced by m'. By Lemma 5.6 (a), $\mathcal{N}H \in K_{A/t}(\widehat{U})$, so

$$\int_W (\mathcal{N}H)^2 \, d\nu \ge \epsilon' \int_{\widehat{U}} (\mathcal{N}H)^2 \, d\nu \, . \tag{5.13}$$

It follows from the definition of β that $\mathcal{M}_a^N \beta^2 \le 1 - \mu\, e^{-NT}$ on W. Using this, (5.12) and (5.13), as in [D2] (see also the proof of Lemma 7.4 in [St1]) we get

$$\int_{\widehat{U}} (\mathcal{N}H)^2 \, d\nu \le \int_{\widehat{U}} (\mathcal{M}_a^N H^2) \, d\nu - \mu\, e^{-NT}\, \epsilon' \int_{\widehat{U}} (\mathcal{N}H)^2 \, d\nu \, ,$$

and therefore $\displaystyle\int_{\widehat{U}} (\mathcal{N}H^2) \, d\nu \le \frac{1}{1 + \mu\, \epsilon'\, e^{-NT}} \int_{\widehat{U}} (\mathcal{M}_a^N H^2) \, d\nu$. Since $\mathcal{M}_a^N H^2 = L_{f^{(0)}}^N \left(e^{(f^{(a)} - f^{(0)})_N}\, H^2 \right) \le e^{N|a|C_0}\, L_{f^{(0)}}^N H^2$ on $\widehat{U}$, it now follows from $|a| \le a_0$ and $L_{f^{(0)}}^* \nu = \nu$ (see Sect. 2) that

$$\int_{\widehat{U}} (\mathcal{N}H^2) \, d\nu \le \frac{e^{N|a|C_0}}{1 + \mu\, \epsilon'\, e^{-NT}} \int_{\widehat{U}} (L_{f^{(0)}}^N H^2) \, d\nu \le \frac{1 + \epsilon_2}{1 + 4\epsilon_2} \int_{\widehat{U}} H^2 \, d\nu \le (1 - \epsilon_2) \int_{\widehat{U}} H^2 \, d\nu \, .$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. ■

In what follows we assume that $h, H \in C_D^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$ are such that

$$H \in K_{E|b|}(\widehat{U}) \quad , \quad |h(u)| \le H(u) \quad , \quad u \in \widehat{U} \, , \tag{5.14}$$

and

$$|h(u) - h(u')| \le E|b| H(u')\, D(u, u') \quad \text{whenever } u, u' \in \widehat{U}_i \, , \; i = 1, \dots, k \, . \tag{5.15}$$

Define the functions $\chi_\ell^{(i)} : \widehat{U} \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ ($\ell = 1, \dots, j_0$, $i = 1, 2$) by

$$\chi_\ell^{(1)}(u) = \frac{\left| e^{(f_N^{(a)} + \mathbf{i} b \tau_N)(v_1^{(\ell)}(u))} h(v_1^{(\ell)}(u)) + e^{(f_N^{(a)} + \mathbf{i} b \tau_N)(v_2^{(\ell)}(u))} h(v_2^{(\ell)}(u)) \right|}{(1 - \mu) e^{f_N^{(a)}(v_1^{(\ell)}(u))} H(v_1^{(\ell)}(u)) + e^{f_N^{(a)}(v_2^{(\ell)}(u))} H(v_2^{(\ell)}(u))} \, ,$$

$$\chi_\ell^{(2)}(u) = \frac{\left| e^{(f_N^{(a)} + \mathbf{i} b \tau_N)(v_1^{(\ell)}(u))} h(v_1^{(\ell)}(u)) + e^{(f_N^{(a)} + \mathbf{i} b \tau_N)(v_2^{(\ell)}(u))} h(v_2^{(\ell)}(u)) \right|}{e^{f_N^{(a)}(v_1^{(\ell)}(u))} H(v_1^{(\ell)}(u)) + (1 - \mu) e^{f_N^{(a)}(v_2^{(\ell)}(u))} H(v_2^{(\ell)}(u))} \, ,$$

and set $\gamma_\ell(u) = b\,[\tau_N(v_2^{(\ell)}(u)) - \tau_N(v_1^{(\ell)}(u))]$, $u \in \widehat{U}$.

Remark. It is easy to see that for any i,j, ℓ the set $\{\tau_N(v_i^{(\ell)}(u)); u \in Z_j\}$ is contained in an interval of length $< \frac{1}{16|b|}$. Indeed, given $u, u' \in \widehat{Z}_j$, consider $v = v_i^{(\ell)}(u), v' = v_i^{(\ell)}(u') \in \widehat{X}_{i,j}^{(\ell)}$. Since $\sigma^{N-n_1}(X_{i,j}^{(\ell)}) = \mathcal{D}_j$, by (5.8) and (2.1), $\mathrm{diam}(\sigma^N(X_{i,j}^{(\ell)})) = \mathrm{diam}(\sigma^{n_1}(\mathcal{D}_j)) \leq \frac{\gamma_1^{n_1}\epsilon_1}{c_0\,|b|}$, so $d(u,u') = d(\sigma^N(v), \sigma^N(v')) \leq \frac{\gamma_1^{n_1}\epsilon_1}{c_0\,|b|}$. This and (2.1) give $d(\sigma^j(v), \sigma^j(v')) \leq \frac{1}{c_0\,\gamma^{N-j}}\,d(u,u') \leq \frac{\gamma_1^{n_1}\gamma^{N-j}\,\epsilon_1}{c_0^2\,|b|}$, so by (5.4), $|\tau_N(v) - \tau_N(v')| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} |\tau(\sigma^j(v)) - \tau(\sigma^j(v'))| \leq \frac{T\,\gamma_1^{n_1}\,\epsilon_1}{c_0^2\,|b|\,(\gamma-1)} < \frac{1}{16\,|b|}$, which proves the claim. Hence $\{\gamma_\ell(u) : u \in Z_j\}$ is contained in an interval of length $< 1/8$.

Lemma 5.9. *Let* $j, j' \in \{1, 2, \ldots, q\}$ *be such that* $\mathcal{D}_j$ *and* $\mathcal{D}_{j'}$ *are contained in* $\mathcal{C}_m$ *and are* ξ_ℓ*-separable in* $\mathcal{C}_m$ *for some* $m = 1, \ldots, p$ *and* $\ell = 1, \ldots, j_0$. *Then* $|\gamma_\ell(u) - \gamma_\ell(u')| \geq c_2\epsilon_1$ *for all* $u \in \widehat{Z}_j$ *and* $u' \in \widehat{Z}_{j'}$, *where* $c_2 = \dfrac{\hat{\delta}\,\rho}{16}$.

Proof of Lemma 5.9. Let $u \in \widehat{Z}_j$ and $u' \in \widehat{Z}_{j'}$; then $v = \psi(u) \in \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_j$ and $v' = \psi(u') \in \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{j'}$. Also $v = r(s)$ and $v' = r(s')$ for some $s, s' \in V_0$. Set $\eta = \frac{s-s'}{\|s-s'\|} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$.

Since $\mathcal{D}_j$ and $\mathcal{D}_{j'}$ are ξ_ℓ-separable in $\mathcal{C}_m$, there exist $v_0 = r(s_0) \in \mathcal{D}_j$ and $v_0' = r(s_0') \in \mathcal{D}_{j'}$ such that $d(v_0, v_0') \geq \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}_m)$ and $\langle \eta_0\ ,\ \xi_\ell \rangle \geq \theta_1$, where $\eta_0 = \dfrac{s_0 - s_0'}{\|s_0 - s_0'\|} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. By (4.2), (5.8) and (5.6), $\|s - s_0\| \leq 2\,d(r(s), r(s_0)) \leq 2\,\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{D}_j) \leq 2\rho^{q_0-1}\,\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}_m)$, and similarly $\|s' - s_0'\| \leq 2\rho^{q_0-1}\,\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}_m)$. This implies

$$\big|\|s - s'\| - \|s_0 - s_0'\|\big| \leq \|s - s_0\| + \|s' - s_0'\| \leq 4\rho^{q_0-1}\,\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}_m)\ . \tag{5.16}$$

Hence $\|\eta_0 - \eta\| = \left\| \frac{s_0-s_0'}{\|s_0-s_0'\|} - \frac{s-s'}{\|s-s'\|} \right\| \leq \frac{8\rho^{q_0-1}\,\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}_m)}{\|s_0-s_0'\|} \leq \frac{16\rho^{q_0-1}\,\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}_m)}{d(v_0,v_0')} \leq 32\rho^{q_0-1}$. Combining this with (5.7) gives $\langle \eta, \xi_\ell \rangle = \langle \eta_0, \xi_\ell \rangle + \langle \eta - \eta_0, \xi_\ell \rangle \geq \theta_1 - 32\rho^{q_0-1} > \theta_0$. Thus, $\eta \in B_\ell$, and Lemma 4.6 implies $\left| I_{\eta,h}[\tau_N(v_2^{(\ell)}(\tilde{r}(\hat{s}))) - \tau_N(v_1^{(\ell)}(\tilde{r}(\hat{s})))] \right| \geq \frac{\hat{\delta}}{2}$ for all $\hat{s} \in V_0$ and $h \neq 0$ such that $\hat{s}, \hat{s} + h\eta \in r^{-1}(U_0 \cap \Lambda) \subset V_0$.

Since $u = \sigma^{n_1}v = \tilde{r}(s)$ and $u' = \tilde{r}(s')$, we have $s, s' \in r^{-1}(U_0 \cap \Lambda)$ and $s = s' + h\eta$ with $h = \|s - s'\|$. It then follows from the above, (5.16) and (5.6) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|b|}\,|\gamma_\ell(u) - \gamma_\ell(u')| &= \left| [\tau_N(v_2^{(\ell)}(\tilde{r}(s))) - \tau_N(v_1^{(\ell)}(\tilde{r}(s)))] - [\tau_N(v_2^{(\ell)}(\tilde{r}(s'))) - \tau_N(v_1^{(\ell)}(\tilde{r}(s')))] \right| \\ &\geq \frac{\hat{\delta}}{2}\,\|s - s'\| \geq \frac{\hat{\delta}}{2}\left(\frac{1}{4}\,\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}_m) - 4\rho^{q_0-1}\,\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}_m)\right) \geq \frac{\hat{\delta}\,\rho\,\epsilon_1}{16\,|b|}\ . \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the following lemma is given in Appendix A.

Lemma 5.10. *Assume* b *is chosen in such a way that* (5.5) *holds. Then for any* $j = 1, \ldots, q$ *there exist* $i = 1, 2$, $j' = 1, \ldots, q$ *and* $\ell = 1, \ldots, j_0$ *such that* $\mathcal{D}_j$ *and* $\mathcal{D}_{j'}$ *are adjacent and* $\chi_\ell^{(i)}(u) \leq 1$ *for all* $u \in \widehat{Z}_{j'}$.

Proof of Lemma 5.3. As before, we assume that N and $\mu > 0$ satisfy (5.1) and (5.10). Define ϵ_1 by (5.4), take $\epsilon_2 = \epsilon_2(N) > 0$ and $a_0 = a_0(N) > 0$ as in Lemma 5.8 and set $\hat{\rho} = 1 - \epsilon_2$.

Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $|a| \leq a_0$ and $|b| \geq b_0 = \epsilon_1/\delta'$. Then for any $J \in \mathsf{J}(\mathsf{a},\mathsf{b})$, Lemma 5.6 (a) implies property (a) in Lemma 5.3 for the operator $\mathcal{N}_J$, while Lemma 5.8 gives property (b) in Lemma 5.3.

To check (c) in Lemma 5.3, assume that $h, H \in C_D^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$ satisfy (5.14) and (5.15). Now define the subset J of $\mathsf{J}(\mathsf{a},\mathsf{b})$ in the following way. First, include in J all $(1,j,\ell) \in \Xi$ such that $\chi_\ell^{(1)}(u) \leq 1$ for all $u \in \widehat{Z}_j$. Then for any $j = 1,\ldots,q$ and $\ell = 1,\ldots,j_0$ include $(2,j,\ell)$ in J if and only if $(1,j,\ell)$ has not been included in J (that is, $\chi_\ell^{(1)}(u) > 1$ for some $u \in \widehat{Z}_j$) and $\chi_\ell^{(2)}(u) \leq 1$ for all $u \in \widehat{Z}_j$. It follows from Lemma 5.10 that J is dense. (Clearly, J depends not only on N, a and b, but on h and H as well.)

Consider the operator $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_J(a,b) : C_D^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U}) \longrightarrow C_D^{\mathrm{Lip}}(\widehat{U})$. Then Lemma 5.6 (b) implies $|(L_{ab}^N\, h)(u) - (L_{ab}^N h)(u')| \leq E|b|(\mathcal{N}\, H)(u')\, D(u,u')$ whenever $u, u' \in \widehat{U}_i$ for some $i = 1,\ldots,k$. So, it remains to show that

$$\left|(L_{ab}^N h)(u)\right| \leq (\mathcal{N}H)(u) \quad , \quad u \in \widehat{U} \; . \tag{5.17}$$

Let $u \in \widehat{U}$. If $u \notin \widehat{Z}_j$ for any $(i,j,\ell) \in J$, then $\beta(v) = 1$ whenever $\sigma^N v = u$ and therefore $\left|(L_{ab}^N h)(u)\right| \leq (\mathcal{M}_a^N(\beta H))(u) = (\mathcal{N}H)(u)$.

Assume that $u \in \widehat{Z}_j$ e.g. for $(1,j,\ell) \in J$; then $(2,j,\ell) \notin J$. Since $\chi_\ell^{(1)}(u) \leq 1$, $\beta(v_1^{(\ell)}(u)) \geq 1-\mu$ and $\beta(v_2^{(\ell)}(u)) = 1$, using (5.14) one derives

$$\begin{aligned} \left|(L_{ab}^N h)(u)\right| \;\; &\leq \sum_{\sigma^N v = u,\; v \neq v_1(u), v_2(u)} e^{f_N^{(a)}(v)} |h(v)| \\ &\quad + \left[e^{f_N^{(a)}(v_1(u))} \beta(v_1(u)) H(v_1(u)) + e^{f_N^{(a)}(v_2(u))} \beta(v_2(u)) H(v_2(u)) \right] \leq (\mathcal{N}H)(u) \; , \end{aligned}$$

which proves (5.17). This completes the proof of Lemma 5.3.■

6 Linearization of pinched Axiom A flows

Let M be a C^2 complete Riemann manifold, ϕ_t be a C^2 flow on M, and let Λ a basic set for ϕ_t. In this section we assume that ϕ_t and Λ satisfy the following *pinching condition*:

(P): *There exist constants $C > 0$ and $\beta \geq \alpha > 0$ such that for every $x \in \Lambda$ we have*

$$\frac{1}{C}\, e^{\alpha_x t}\, \|u\| \leq \|d\phi_t(x) \cdot u\| \leq C\, e^{\beta_x t}\, \|u\| \quad , \quad u \in E^u(x) \;, t > 0 \; ,$$

for some constants $\alpha_x, \beta_x > 0$ depending on x but independent of u and t with $\alpha \leq \alpha_x \leq \beta_x \leq \beta$ and $2\alpha_x - \beta_x \geq \alpha$ for all $x \in \Lambda$.

We prove that under this condition the flow ϕ_t on unstable manifolds is locally conjugate to its linearization $d\phi_t$ via C^1 (local) maps with uniformly bounded derivatives. This is used in Sect. 7 to show that the condition (P) implies regular distortion along unstable manifolds over Λ.

Notice that when the local unstable manifolds are one-dimensional the condition (P) is always satisfied. In higher dimensions a well-known example when (P) holds is the geodesic flow on a manifold with strictly negative sectional curvature satisfying the so called $\frac{1}{4}$-pinching condition (see [HP]). For open billiard flows (in any dimension) it was shown in [St2] that if the distance between the scatterers is large compared with the maximal sectional curvature of the boundaries, then the condition (P) is satisfied over the non-wandering set.

It should be remarked that a linearization of the flow via a family of homeomorphisms exists for any flow on any basic set (see Sect. 4 in [PS]), however in general it does not have to be Lipschitz.

Fix constants $C > 0$ and $\beta \geq \alpha > 0$ and for each $x \in \Lambda$ constants $\alpha_x \leq \beta_x$ with the properties in (P). Throughout we use the notation $m(A) = 1/\|A^{-1}\|$ for an invertible linear operator A. For any $x_0 \in \Lambda$ and any $x \in W^u_\epsilon(x_0)$, set $E^u(x) = T_x(W^u_\epsilon(x_0))$. Clearly, $d\phi_t(x) \cdot E^u(x) = E^u(\phi_t(x))$ for any $t \leq 0$. Notice that $W^u_\epsilon(\Lambda) = \cup_{x\in\Lambda} W^u_\epsilon(x)$ is a compact subset of M.

Take $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1/2)$ such that for any $x \in \Lambda$, $\exp^u_x : E^u(x;\epsilon_0) \longrightarrow \exp^u_x(E^u(x;\epsilon_0)) \subset W^u_{\epsilon_0}(x)$ is a diffeomorphism. We will assume the constant $C \geq 1$ is so large that

$$\|d\exp^u_x(u)\| \leq C \quad , \quad \|(d\exp^u_x(u))^{-1}\| \leq C \quad , \quad x \in W^u_{\epsilon_0}(\Lambda)\ ,\ u \in E^u(x;\epsilon_0)\ . \tag{6.1}$$

Choose an arbitrary $t_0 > 0$ such that

$$\gamma = 8C^3\, e^{-\alpha\, t_0/2} < 1\ , \tag{6.2}$$

and fix it. Set $f = \phi_{t_0}$ and fix a constant $\epsilon_1 \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ such that for any $x \in W^u_{\epsilon_0}(\Lambda)$ the map

$$\hat{f}_x = (\exp^u_{f(x)})^{-1} \circ f \circ \exp^u_x : E^u(x;\epsilon_1) \longrightarrow E^u(f(x);\epsilon_0)$$

is well-defined (and therefore C^2).

For any $y \in W^u_{\epsilon_0}(\Lambda)$ and any integer $k \geq 1$ we will use the notation

$$\hat{f}^k_y = \hat{f}_{f^{k-1}(y)} \circ \ldots \circ \hat{f}_{f(y)} \circ \hat{f}_y \quad , \quad \hat{f}^{-k}_y = (\hat{f}_{f^{-k}(y)})^{-1} \circ \ldots \circ (\hat{f}_{f^{-2}(y)})^{-1} \circ (\hat{f}_{f^{-1}(y)})^{-1}\ ,$$

at any point where these sequences of maps are well-defined.

Given $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_1)$, the set

$$\widehat{\Lambda}^u_x(\epsilon) = \{u \in E^u(x;\epsilon) : \exp^u_x(u) \in \Lambda\}$$

is the *local representative of* Λ in $E^u(x)$. Notice that $\hat{f}^{-1}_x(\widehat{\Lambda}^u_x) \subset \widehat{\Lambda}^u_{f^{-1}(x)}$ for any $x \in \Lambda$.

Our aim in this section is to show that under the pinching condition (P) we can locally linearize the maps $\hat{f}_x$ by a continuous family of local diffeomorphisms and that family 'linearizes' the sets $\widehat{\Lambda}^u_x$, as well. More precisely, we have the following:

Theorem 6.1. *Assume that* ϕ_t *and* Λ *satisfy the pinching condition* (P). *Then there exists a constant* $\epsilon_2 \in (0, \epsilon_1/2]$ *such that for every* $x \in W^u_{\epsilon_2}(\Lambda)$ *we have the following:*

(a) *For every* $u \in E^u(x;\epsilon_2)$ *there exists* $F_x(u) = \lim_{p\to\infty} d\hat{f}^p_{f^{-p}(x)}(0) \cdot \hat{f}^{-p}_x(u) \in E^u(x;2\epsilon_2)$. *Moreover, there exists a constant* $C_1 > 0$ *such that* $\|F_x(u) - d\hat{f}^p_{f^{-p}(x)}(0) \cdot \hat{f}^{-p}_x(u)\| \leq C_1\,\gamma^p\,\|u\|^2$ *for any* $u \in E^u(x,\epsilon_2)$ *and any integer* $p \geq 0$.

(b) *The map* $F_x : E^u(x;\epsilon_2) \longrightarrow F_x(E^u(x;\epsilon_2)) \subset E^u(x;2\epsilon_2)$ *is a* C^1 *diffeomorphism with uniformly bounded derivatives.*

(c) *For any integer* $q \geq 1$ *we have* $d\hat{f}^{-q}_x(0) \circ F_x(v) = F_{f^{-q}(x)} \circ \hat{f}^{-q}_x(v)$ *for any* $v \in E^u(x;\epsilon_2)$.

(d) *For any* $\xi, u \in E^u(x;\epsilon_2/2)$ *there exist the limits*

$$L_{x,\xi} = \lim_{p\to\infty} d\hat{f}^p_{f^{-p}(x)}(\hat{f}^{-p}_x(\xi)) \circ d\hat{f}^{-p}_x(0) \quad , \quad F_{x,\xi}(u) = \lim_{p\to\infty} d\hat{f}^p_{f^{-p}(x)}(\hat{f}^{-p}_x(\xi)) \circ \hat{f}^{-p}_x(u)\ .$$

Moreover, for the linear map $L_{x,\xi}$ *we have* $\|L_{x,\xi}\| \leq 2$, *while* $F_{x,\xi}(u) = L_{x,\xi} \circ F_x(u)$.

As an immediate consequence of the above one gets the following, where we use the notation $\hat{\phi}_{x,t} = (\exp^u_{\phi_t(x)})^{-1} \circ \phi_t \circ \exp^u_x$ for any $x \in K$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Corollary 6.2. *For any* $x \in W^u_{\epsilon_2}(\Lambda)$ *we have* $F_x(u) = \lim_{t\to\infty} d\phi_t(\phi_{-t}(x)) \cdot \hat{\phi}_{x,t}(u)$. *Moreover,* $d\phi_t(x) \cdot F_x(u) = F_{\phi_t(x)}(\hat{\phi}_{x,t}(u))$ *for* $t \geq 0$ *and* $u \in E^u(x)$ *with* $\|\hat{\phi}_{x,t}(u)\| \leq \epsilon_2$.

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 6.1.

Taylor's formula and the compactness of $W^u_{\epsilon_0}(\Lambda)$, imply that there exists a constant $D > 0$ such that

$$\text{(6.3)} \quad \|\hat{f}_x(v) - \hat{f}_x(u) - d\hat{f}_x(u) \cdot (v-u)\| \leq D\, \|v-u\|^2 \quad , \quad x \in W^u_{\epsilon_0}(\Lambda)\ ,\ u, v \in E^u(x;\epsilon_1)\ .$$

Since ϕ_t is C^2, we can take D so large that

$$\text{(6.4)} \qquad \|d\hat{f}_x(u) - d\hat{f}_x(0)\| \leq D\, \|u\| \quad , \quad x \in W^u_{\epsilon_0}(\Lambda)\ ,\ u \in E^u(x;\epsilon_1)\ .$$

Combining the latter with (6.3) gives

$$\text{(6.5)} \qquad \|\hat{f}_x(v) - \hat{f}_x(u) - d\hat{f}_x(0) \cdot (v-u)\| \leq D\, \left[\|v-u\|^2 + \|u\|\, \|v-u\|\right]$$

for all $x \in W^u_{\epsilon_0}(\Lambda)$ and all $u, v \in E^u(x;\epsilon_1)$.

Next, for each $x \in \Lambda$ set $\hat{\alpha}_x = \alpha_x - \alpha/8$ and $\hat{\beta}_x = \beta_x + \alpha/4$. Then $2\hat{\alpha}_x - \hat{\beta}_x \geq \alpha/2$, so by (6.2),

$$8C^3\, e^{(\hat{\beta}_x - 2\hat{\alpha}_x)\, t_0} \leq \gamma = 8C^3\, e^{-\alpha\, t_0/2} < 1\ .$$

Assuming $\epsilon_1 < \frac{C\, e^{\alpha\, t_0}}{D} \min\{e^{\alpha\, t_0/16} - 1, (1 - e^{-\alpha\, t_0/8})/C^2\}$, one derives from (P) and (6.4) that

$$\text{(6.6)} \qquad \frac{1}{C}\, e^{(\hat{\alpha}_x + \alpha/16)\, t_0}\, \|u\| \leq \|d\hat{f}_x(\eta) \cdot u\| \leq C\, e^{(\hat{\beta}_x - \alpha/8)\, t_0}\, \|u\|$$

for all $x \in \Lambda$, $\eta \in E^u(x;\epsilon_1)$ and $u \in E^u(x)$.

Finally, assuming also that $\epsilon_1 \leq \frac{1}{4D\,C}$, the above and (6.3) imply

$$\mu_x\, e^{\alpha\, t_0/16}\, \|u-v\| \leq \|\hat{f}_x(v) - \hat{f}_x(u)\| \leq \lambda_x\, e^{-\alpha\, t_0/8}\, \|u-v\| \quad , \quad x \in \Lambda\ ,\ u, v \in E^u(x;\epsilon_1)\ ,$$

where $1 < \mu_x = \frac{1}{2C}\, e^{\hat{\alpha}_x\, t_0} < \lambda_x = 2C\, e^{\hat{\beta}_x\, t_0}$.

In fact, replacing $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and $\epsilon_2 > 0$ by smaller numbers if necessary, we can arrange that

$$\text{(6.7)} \qquad \mu_x\, \|u-v\| \leq \|\hat{f}_x(v) - \hat{f}_x(u)\| \leq \lambda_x\, \|u-v\| \quad , \quad x \in W^u_{\epsilon_2}(\Lambda); u, v \in E^u(x;\epsilon_1)\ .$$

Indeed, assume $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and $\epsilon_2 > 0$ are so small that $G^y_x = (\exp^u_y)^{-1} \circ \exp^u_x : E^u(x;\epsilon_1) \longrightarrow E^u(y;\epsilon_0)$ is well-defined for $y \in W^u_{\epsilon_2}(x)$, $x \in \Lambda$; it is then a C^2 map with uniformly bounded derivatives. Since $G^x_x = \mathrm{id}$, dG^y_x can be made arbitrarily close to id taking $\epsilon_2 > 0$ sufficiently small. Fix $\delta > 0$ so small that $(1+\delta)^2 < e^{\alpha\, t_0/8}$ and $(1-\delta)^2 > e^{-\alpha\, t_0/16}$, and then take $\epsilon'_1 > 0$ and $\epsilon_2 > 0$ so small that $\|dG^y_x - \mathrm{id}\| \leq \delta$ and $\|G^y_x(u)\| \leq \epsilon_1$ for all $x \in \Lambda$, $y \in W^u_{\epsilon_2}(x)$ and $u \in E^u(x;\epsilon'_1)$. Given $x_0 \in \Lambda$, $x \in W^u_{\epsilon_2}(x_0)$ and $u, v \in E^u(x;\epsilon'_1)$, setting $u' = G^{x_0}_x(u)$, $v' = G^{x_0}_x(v)$, it is easy to see that $\|\hat{f}_x(u) - \hat{f}_x(v)\| \leq \lambda_x\, \|u-v\|$. Similarly, $\|\hat{f}_x(u) - \hat{f}_x(v)\| \geq \mu_x\, \|u-v\|$. Now replacing ϵ_1 by ϵ'_1 proves (6.7).

Notice that

$$\text{(6.8)} \qquad \lambda_x\, \mu_x^{-2} = 8C^3\, e^{(\hat{\beta}_x - 2\hat{\alpha}_x)t_0} \leq \gamma < 1 \quad , \quad x \in \Lambda\ .$$

The following is the main step in the proof of Theorem 6.1.

Lemma 6.3. *There exist constants* $C_1 > 0$, $\epsilon_1 \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ *and* $\epsilon_2 \in (0, \epsilon_1/(2C_1)]$ *with the following properties:*

(a) *If* $z \in W^u_{\epsilon_2}(\Lambda)$ *and* $\|\hat{f}^p_z(v)\| \leq \epsilon_2$ *for some* $v \in E^u(z;\epsilon_1)$ *and some integer* $p \geq 1$, *then* $\|d\hat{f}^p_z(0)\cdot v - \hat{f}^p_z(v)\| \leq C_1\, \|\hat{f}^p_z(v)\|^2$, *and therefore* $\|d\hat{f}^p_z(0)\cdot v\| \leq 2\|\hat{f}^p_z(v)\|$. *Similarly, if* $\|d\hat{f}^p_z(0)\cdot v\| \leq \epsilon_2$ *for some* $v \in E^u(z;\epsilon_1)$ *and some integer* $p \geq 1$, *then* $\|\hat{f}^p_z(v) - d\hat{f}^p_z(0)\cdot v\| \leq C_1\, \|d\hat{f}^p_z(0)\cdot v\|^2$, *and so* $\|\hat{f}^p_z(v)\| \leq 2\|d\hat{f}^p_z(0)\cdot v\|$.

(b) *If* $z \in W^u_{\epsilon_2}(\Lambda)$ *and* $\|\hat{f}^p_z(v)\| \leq \epsilon_2$, $\|\hat{f}^p_z(\xi)\| \leq \epsilon_2$ *for some* $v, \xi \in E^u(z;\epsilon_2)$ *and some integer* $p \geq 1$, *then* $\|d\hat{f}^p_z(\xi)\cdot v - d\hat{f}^p_z(0)\cdot v\| \leq C_1\, \|d\hat{f}^p_z(0)\cdot v\|\, \|\hat{f}^p_z(\xi)\|$.

(c) *For any* $y \in W^u_{\epsilon_2}(\Lambda)$ *and any integer* $p \geq 1$ *the map* $F^{(p)}_y = d\hat{f}^p_{f^{-p}(y)}(0)\circ(\hat{f}^p_y)^{-1} : E^u_y(\epsilon_2) \longrightarrow E^u_y(2\epsilon_2)$ *is such that*

$$\left\| \left[F^{(p)}_y(a) - F^{(p)}_y(b)\right] - [a-b]\right\| \leq C_1\ \left[\|a-b\|^2 + \|b\|\cdot\|a-b\|\right] \quad , \quad a, b \in E^u(y;\epsilon_2)\ .$$

Similar estimates hold for the map $\hat{f}^p_{f^{-p}(y)} \circ (d\hat{f}^p_y(0))^{-1} : E^u(y;\epsilon_2) \longrightarrow E^u(y;2\epsilon_2)$.

(d) *For any* $y \in W^u_{\epsilon_2}(\Lambda)$, *any* $\eta \in E^u(y;\epsilon_2)$ *and any integer* $p \geq 1$ *the linear map* $L^{(p)}_{y,\eta} = d\hat{f}^p_{f^{-p}(y)}(\hat{f}^{-p}_x(\eta)) \circ (d\hat{f}^p_y(0))^{-1} : E^u(y) \longrightarrow E^u(y)$ *is such that* $\left\|L^{(p)}_{y,\eta}(a) - a\right\| \leq C_1\, \|a\|\, \|\eta\|$ *for all* $a \in E^u(y;\epsilon_2)$, *so* $\|L^{(p)}_{y,\eta}\| \leq 2$ *for all* p.

The proof of this lemma is given in Appendix A.

Proof of Theorem 6.1. Let $\epsilon_2 \in (0, \epsilon_1/(2C_1)]$ and $C_1 > 1$ be as in Lemma 6.3. Fix arbitrary $x_0 \in \Lambda$ and $x \in W^u_{\epsilon_2}(x_0)$ and set $x_p = f^{-p}(x)$ for any integer $p \geq 0$. (Notice the different meaning of this notation here.) In what follows we use the maps $F^{(p)}_y$ ($y \in \Lambda$, $p \geq 1$) from Lemma 6.3.

(a), (d) Given $u, \xi \in E^u(x, \epsilon_2/2)$ and $p \geq 1$, set $u_p = F^{(p)}_x(u) \in E^u(x;2\epsilon_2)$, $\zeta_p = L^{(p)}_{x,\xi}(u)$ To show that the sequences $\{u_p\}$ and ζ_p are Cauchy, consider any $q > p$ and set $v = \hat{f}^{-p}_x(u) \in E^u(x_p, \epsilon_2)$. By (6.7), $\|v\| \leq \frac{\|u\|}{\mu_{x_1}\,\mu_{x_2}\cdots\mu_{x_p}}$. From Lemma 6.3(a) we know that $\|v_{q-p} - v\| \leq C_1\, \|v\|^2$, i.e. $\|d\hat{f}^{(q-p)}_{x_q}(0)\cdot(\hat{f}^{-(q-p)}_{x_p}(v)) - v\| \leq C_1\, \|v\|^2$. Applying $d\hat{f}^p_{x_p}(0)$ to the latter and using the estimate for $\|v\|$ and (6.8), we get

$$\|u_q - u_p\| = \|d\hat{f}^q_{x_q}(0)\cdot(\hat{f}^{-q}_x(u)) - d\hat{f}^p_{x_p}(0)\cdot v\| \leq \lambda_{x_p}\,\lambda_{x_{p-1}}\ldots\lambda_{x_1}\, C_1\, \|v\|^2 \leq C_1\, \gamma^p\, \|u\|^2\ .$$

Thus, $\{u_p\}$ is Cauchy, so there exists $F_x(u) = \lim_{p\to\infty} u_p$. Moreover, letting $q \to \infty$ in the above gives $\|F_x(u) - u_p\| \leq C_1\, \gamma^p\, \|u\|^2$ for all $u \in E^u(x;\epsilon_2)$ and $p \geq 1$.

In a similar way, $\|\zeta_q - \zeta_p\| \leq C_1\, \gamma^p\, \|u\|\, \|\xi\|$, so $\{\zeta_p\}$ is Cauchy. Thus, there exists $L_{x,\xi}(u) = \lim_{p\to\infty} L^{(p)}_{x,\xi}(u)$. Moreover, letting $q \to \infty$ in the above gives $\|L_{x,\xi}(u) - L^{(p)}_{x,\xi}(u)\| \leq C_1\, \gamma^p\, \|u\|\, \|\xi\|$ for all $u \in E^u(x;\epsilon_2/2)$ and $p \geq 1$. By Lemma 6.3(d), $\|L^{(p)}_{x,\xi}\| \leq 2$ for all $p \geq 1$, so $\|L_{x,\xi}\| \leq 2$, as well.

It remains to show that $F_{x,\xi}(u)$ exists and $F_{x,\xi}(u) = L_{x,\xi}\circ F_x(u)$. Setting $\xi_p = \hat{f}^{-p}_x(\xi)$, we have

$$d\hat{f}^p_{x_p}(\xi_p)\cdot \hat{f}^{-p}_x(u) = L^{(p)}_{x,\xi}\circ\left(d\hat{f}^p_{x_p}(0)\cdot\hat{f}^{-p}_x(u)\right) = L^{(p)}_{x,\xi}\circ F^{(p)}_x(u)\ .$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned}\|L_{x,\xi}(F_x(u)) - L^{(p)}_{x,\xi}(F^{(p)}_x(u))\| &\leq \|L_{x,\xi}(F_x(u)) - L^{(p)}_{x,\xi}(F_x(u))\| + \|L^{(p)}_{x,\xi}(F_x(u)) - F^{(p)}_x(u))\| \\ &\leq C_1\,\gamma^p\,\|F_x(u)\|\,\|\xi\| + 2\|F_x(u) - F^{(p)}_x(u)\| \to 0\end{aligned}$$

as $p \to \infty$. Thus, there exists $\lim_{p\to\infty} L^{(p)}_{x,\xi}(F^{(p)}_x(u)) = L_{x,\xi}(F_x(u))$.

(b) Given $u, v \in E^u(x; \epsilon_2)$ and $p \geq 0$, it follows from Lemma 6.3(c) that

$$\|(u_p - v_p) - (u - v)\| \leq C_1 \left[\|u - v\|^2 + \|v\| \cdot \|u - v\|\right] .$$

Letting $p \to \infty$, gives $\|F_x(u) - F_x(v) - (u - v)\| \leq C_1 [\|u - v\|^2 + \|v\| \cdot \|u - v\|]$. In particular, there exists $dF_x(0) = I = \mathrm{id}$.

It remains to show that F_x is a C^1 diffeomorphism. Assuming $\epsilon_1 \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ and $\epsilon_2 \in (0, \epsilon_1/(2C_1))$ are small enough, $G^y_x = (\exp^u_y)^{-1} \circ \exp^u_x : E^u(x; \epsilon_1) \longrightarrow E^u(y; \epsilon_0)$ is well-defined and C^2 (with uniformly bounded derivatives) for $y \in W^u_{\epsilon_2}(x)$. Moreover, there exists a constant $D_1 > 0$ such that for any such x, y and $u, v \in E^u(x; \epsilon_1)$ we have $\|dG^y_x(v)\| \leq D_1$, $\|G^y_x(u) - G^y_x(v)\| \leq D_1\|u - v\|$, $\|dG^y_x(u) - dG^y_x(v)\| \leq D_1\|u - v\|$, and $\|G^y_x(u) - G^y_x(v) - dG^y_x(v) \cdot (u - v)\| \leq D_1 \|u - v\|^2$ for $\|u\|, \|v\| < \epsilon_1$.

Given x, y as above, set $x_p = f^{-p}(x)$, $y_p = f^{-p}(y)$, and notice that

$$G^y_x \circ \hat{f}^p_{x_p}(w) = \hat{f}^p_{y_p} \circ G^{y_p}_{x_p}(w) \tag{6.9}$$

for any $w \in E^u(x_p, \epsilon_1)$ with $\|\hat{f}^p_{x_p}(w)\| \leq \epsilon_1$.

Let $\xi \in E^u(x; \epsilon_2/2)$. Setting $y = \exp^u_x(\xi)$ and $\eta = (\exp^u_y)^{-1}(x)$, we have $G^y_x(\xi) = 0$ and $G^y_x(0) = \eta$. We will show that

$$F_x(u) = dG^x_y(\eta) \circ L_{y,\eta}\left(F_y \circ G^y_x(u) - F_y(\eta)\right) \ , \tag{6.10}$$

for any $u \in E^u(x; \epsilon_2/2)$. This would imply that there exists

$$dF_x(\xi) = dG^x_y(\eta) \circ L_{y,\eta} \circ dF_y(0) \circ dG^y_x(\xi) = dG^x_y(\eta) \circ L_{y,\eta} \circ dG^y_x(\xi) \ ,$$

so F_x is C^1 on $E^u(x; \epsilon_2/2)$.

To prove (6.10), consider any $u \in E^u(x; \epsilon_2)$, and set $v = G^y_x(u) \in E^u(y)$, $u_p = d\hat{f}^p_{x_p}(0) \cdot \hat{f}_x^{-p}(u)$, $v_p = d\hat{f}^p_{y_p}(0) \cdot \hat{f}_y^{-p}(v)$, $\xi_p = d\hat{f}^p_{x_p}(0) \cdot \hat{f}_x^{-p}(\xi)$, $\eta_p = d\hat{f}^p_{y_p}(0) \cdot \hat{f}_y^{-p}(\eta)$, $\tilde{u}_p = \hat{f}_x^{-p}(u)$, $\tilde{v}_p = \hat{f}_y^{-p}(v)$, $\tilde{\xi}_p = \hat{f}_x^{-p}(\xi)$, $\tilde{\eta}_p = \hat{f}_y^{-p}(\eta)$. Then by (6.9), $G^{y_p}_{x_p}(\tilde{u}_p) = \tilde{v}_p$, $G^{y_p}_{x_p}(\tilde{\xi}_p) = 0$ and $G^{y_p}_{x_p}(0) = \tilde{\eta}_p$. Thus,

$$\tilde{u}_p = G^{x_p}_{y_p}(\tilde{v}_p) - G^{x_p}_{y_p}(\tilde{\eta}_p) = dG^{x_p}_{y_p}(\tilde{\eta}_p) \cdot (\tilde{v}_p - \tilde{\eta}_p) + w'_p \ ,$$

for some w'_p with $\|w'_p\| \leq D_1 \|\tilde{v}_p - \tilde{\eta}_p\|^2$, and therefore, using (6.9),

$$\begin{aligned} u_p &= d\hat{f}^p_{x_p}(0) \cdot \tilde{u}_p = d\hat{f}^p_{x_p}(0) \circ dG^{x_p}_{y_p}(\tilde{\eta}_p) \cdot (\tilde{v}_p - \tilde{\eta}_p) + d\hat{f}^p_{x_p}(0) \cdot w'_p \\ &= dG^x_y(\eta) \circ d\hat{f}^p_{y_p}(\tilde{\eta}_p) \cdot (\tilde{v}_p - \tilde{\eta}_p) + d\hat{f}^p_{x_p}(0) \cdot w'_p \end{aligned}$$

Next, $d\hat{f}^p_{y_p}(\tilde{\eta}_p) \cdot (\tilde{v}_p - \tilde{\eta}_p) = L^{(p)}_{y,\eta} \circ F^{(p)}_y(v) - L^{(p)}_{y,\eta} \circ F^{(p)}_y(\eta) \to L_{y,\eta} \circ F_y(v) - L_{y,\eta} \circ F_y(\eta)$ as $p \to \infty$, and

$$\|d\hat{f}^p_{x_p}(0) \cdot w'_p\| \leq \lambda_{x_1} \ldots \lambda_{x_p} \|w'_p\| \leq D_1^2 \, \frac{\lambda_{x_1} \ldots \lambda_{x_p}}{\mu^2_{x_1} \ldots \mu^2_{x_p}} \, \|u\| \, \|\eta\| \leq D_1^2 \, \gamma^p \, \|u\| \, \|\eta\| \ ,$$

so $\lim_{p\to\infty} \|d\hat{f}^p_{x_p}(0) \cdot w'_p\| = 0$. Thus, $F_x(u) = \lim_{p\to\infty} u_p = dG^x_y(\eta) \circ L_{y,\eta} \cdot (F_y(v) - F_y(\eta))$, which proves (6.10). Hence F_x is C^1 on $E^u(x; \epsilon_2/2)$. Replacing ϵ_2 by a smaller number we have that F_x is C^1 on $E^u(x; \epsilon_2)$.

(c) This follows easily from the definition of F_x. ■

7 Ball size comparison in Bowen's metric

Let M be a C^2 Riemann manifold and let Λ be a basic set for a C^2 flow $\phi_t : M \longrightarrow M$ satisfying the pinching condition (P) from Sect. 6.

Let n be the *dimension of the (local) unstable manifolds* $W^u_\epsilon(x)$, $x \in \Lambda$.

Theorem 7.1. *Assume that* ϕ_t *and* Λ *satisfy the condition* (P). *Then* Λ *has a regular distortion along unstable manifolds.*

To prove Theorem 7.1 we will first establish the following local version of its.

Lemma 7.2. *There exists a constant* $\epsilon_3 > 0$ *with the following properties:*

(a) *For any* $x \in \Lambda$ *and any* $0 < \delta \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_3$ *there exist a constant* $C = C(x, \delta, \epsilon) > 0$ *and an open neighbourhood* $V_0 = V_0(x, \delta)$ *of* x *in* $W^s_{\epsilon_0}(x) \cap \Lambda$ *such that* $\mathrm{diam}\,(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(\phi_{-T}(y), \epsilon)) \leq C\,\mathrm{diam}\,(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(\phi_{-T}(y), \delta))$ *for any* $y \in V_0$ *and any* $T \geq 0$.

(b) *For any* $x \in \Lambda$ *and any* $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_3$ *there exists an open neighbourhood* $V_0 = V_0(x, \epsilon)$ *of* x *in* $W^s_{\epsilon_0}(x) \cap \Lambda$ *with the following property: for any* $\rho \in (0, 1)$ *there exists* $\delta \in (0, \epsilon]$ *such that for any* $y \in V_0$ *and any* $T \geq 0$ *we have* $\mathrm{diam}\,(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(\phi_{-T}(y), \delta)) \leq \rho\,\mathrm{diam}\,(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(\phi_{-T}(y), \epsilon))$.

Fix $t_0 > 0$ with (6.2). The compactness of Λ and the smoothness of the flow ϕ_t imply the existence of a constant $C_2 \geq 1$ such that

$$d(\phi_t(y), \phi_t(z)) \leq C_2\, d(y, z) \quad , \quad y, z \in \Lambda\, , |t| \leq t_0\, . \tag{7.1}$$

For a non-empty set $X \subset E^u(x)$ and $r > 0$ set

$$\ell(X) = \sup\{\|u\| : u \in X\} \quad , \quad X(r) = \{u \in X : \|u\| \leq r\}\, .$$

Before proving Lemma 7.2 we will first use it to derive Theorem 7.1. The proof of the following consequence of Lemma 7.2 is straightforward and we omit it.

Lemma 7.3. *There exists a constant* $\hat{\epsilon}_0 \in (0, \epsilon_3]$ *with the following properties:*

(a) *For any* $x \in \Lambda$ *and any* $0 < \delta \leq \epsilon \leq \hat{\epsilon}_0$ *there exist a constant* $R_x = R(x, \delta, \epsilon) > 0$ *and an open neighbourhood* $\mathcal{O}_x$ *of* x *in* Λ *such that* $\ell\,(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(z, \epsilon)) \leq R_x\, \ell\,(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(z, \delta))$ *for any* $z \in \Lambda$ *and* $T > 0$ *with* $\phi_T(z) \in \mathcal{O}_x$.

(b) *For any* $x \in \Lambda$, *any* $0 < \epsilon \leq \hat{\epsilon}_0$ *and any* $\rho \in (0, 1)$ *there exist* $\delta \in (0, \epsilon)$ *and an open neighbourhood* $\mathcal{O}_x$ *of* x *in* Λ *such that* $\ell\,(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(z, \delta)) \leq \rho\, \ell\,(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(z, \epsilon))$ *for any* $z \in \Lambda$ *and* $T > 0$ *with* $\phi_T(z) \in \mathcal{O}_x$. ■

Proof of Theorem 7.1. Choose $\hat{\epsilon}_0 > 0$ as in Lemma 7.3.

(a) Let $0 < \delta \leq \epsilon \leq \hat{\epsilon}_0$. It follows from Lemma 7.3(a) that for any $x \in \Lambda$ there exist a constant $R_x = R(x, \delta, \epsilon) > 0$ and an open neighbourhood $\mathcal{O}_x$ of x in Λ such that $\ell(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(z, \epsilon)) \leq R_x\, \ell(\Lambda \cap B^u_T(z, \delta))$ for any $z \in \Lambda$ and $T > 0$ with $\phi_T(z) \in \mathcal{O}_x$. Since Λ is compact, there exist finitely many neighbourhoods $\mathcal{O}_{x_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{O}_{x_m}$ covering Λ. Then $R = 2 \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} R_{x_j} > 0$ satisfies (7.1) for any $z \in \Lambda$ and any $T > 0$.

The proof of part (b) in the definition of regular distortion along unstable manifolds is similar and we omit it. ■

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Lemma 7.2.

For $y \in \Lambda$, $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ and an integer $p \geq 0$, set

$$\widehat{B}^u_p(y, \epsilon) = \{v \in E^u(y; \epsilon_0) : \|\hat{f}^p_y(v)\| \leq \epsilon\} .$$

Since the maps $\hat{f}_z$ are expanding distances on $E^u(z; \epsilon_1)$, clearly $v \in \widehat{B}^u_p(y, \epsilon)$ is equivalent to $\|\hat{f}^j_y(v)\| \leq \epsilon$ for all $j = 0, 1, \ldots, p$.

Choose the constants $0 < \epsilon_2 < \epsilon_1 \leq \epsilon_0$ and $C_1 > 1$ as in Sect. 6, assuming that $6\epsilon_2 \, C_1 < 1$. In what follows we will use the notation from Sect. 6.

Assuming $\epsilon_1 \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ is sufficiently small, for any $x \in \Lambda$ and $y \in \Lambda \cap W^s_{\epsilon_1}(x)$ the local *holonomy map* $\mathcal{H}^y_x : W^u_{\epsilon_1}(x) \longrightarrow W^u_{\epsilon_0}(y)$ along stable laminations is well-defined and uniformly Hölder continuous (see e.g. [HPS] or [PSW]). Further, we will assume that the constant ϵ_2 from Lemma 6.3 is chosen so small that for any $x \in \Lambda$ and any $y \in \Lambda \cap W^s_{\epsilon_1}(x)$ the *pseudo-holonomy map*

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^y_x = (\exp^u_y)^{-1} \circ \mathcal{H}^y_x \circ \exp^u_x : E^u(x; \epsilon_2) \longrightarrow E^u(y; \epsilon_1)$$

is well-defined and uniformly Hölder. Notice that $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^y_x(\widehat{\Lambda}^u_x(\epsilon_2)) \subset \widehat{\Lambda}^u_y(\epsilon_1)$ for any $x \in \Lambda$ and any $y \in \Lambda \cap W^s_{\epsilon_1}(x)$.

Thus, instead of dealing with sets of the form $\Lambda \cap B^u_T(\phi_{-T}(y), \epsilon)$ in Lemma 7.2, it is enough to prove the analogous statements for sets of the form $\Lambda \cap B^u_{pt_0}(f^{-p}(y), \epsilon)$, $p \geq 1$, which in turn combined with the local uniform Lipschitzness of the maps $\exp^u_y$ leads to analogous statements for sets of the form $\widehat{\Lambda}^u_{f^{-p}(y)}(\epsilon) \cap \widehat{B}^u_p(f^{-p}(y), \epsilon)$.

Recall the maps F_x from Theorem 6.1. For the proof of Lemma 7.2 we will also need the sets

$$\widetilde{B}^u_p(z, \epsilon) = \{u \in E^u(z) : \|d\hat{f}^p_z(0) \cdot u\| \leq \epsilon\} \quad , \quad \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_x = F_x(\widehat{\Lambda}^u_x(\epsilon_2)) \subset E^u(x; 2\epsilon_2) ,$$

and the maps $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^y_x = F_y \circ \widehat{\mathcal{H}}^y_x \circ (F_x)^{-1} : E^u(x; \epsilon'_2) \longrightarrow E^u(y; \epsilon_1)$. Clearly we can take $\epsilon'_2 \in (0, \epsilon_2]$ independent of x and y so that the above is well-defined and uniformly Hölder for any $x \in \Lambda$ and any $y \in \Lambda \cap W^s_{\epsilon_1}(x)$. Moreover we have $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^y_x(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_x(\epsilon'_2)) \subset \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_y(\epsilon_2)$. Another property of the sets $\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_x$ is contained in the following immediate consequence of Theorem 6.1.

Corollary 7.4. *For any $x \in \Lambda$, any $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_2/2]$ and any $p \geq 1$, setting $x_p = f^{-p}(x)$ we have $d\hat{f}^p_{x_p}(0)(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_{x_p}(\epsilon) \cap \widetilde{B}^u_p(x_p, \epsilon)) \subset \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_x(\epsilon)$. More generally, $d\phi_t(x) \cdot \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_x(\epsilon) \subset \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_{\phi_t(x)}(\epsilon)$ for all $x \in \Lambda, t \leq 0$ and $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_2]$.*

The following lemma is rather important for the proof of the central Lemma 7.2. It describes some sort of a 'tangent bundle' $E^u_\Lambda(x)$ $(x \in \Lambda)$ to the set Λ which is $d\phi_t$-invariant and has some continuity properties, as well.

Given $x \in \Lambda$, let $m_x \geq 1$ be the minimal integer such that there exists $\epsilon(x) \leq \epsilon_2$ with $\dim(\mathrm{span}(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_x(\delta))) = m_x$ for all $0 < \delta \leq \epsilon(x)$. Then the linear subspace $E^u_\Lambda(x) = \mathrm{span}(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_x(\delta))$ is the same for all $\delta \in (0, \epsilon(x)]$. Corollary 7.4 shows that $m_{\phi_t(x)} = m_x$ and $d\phi_t(x)(E^u_\Lambda(x)) = E^u_\Lambda(\phi_t(x))$ for all $x \in \Lambda$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 7.5. *There exists an integer m such that $m_x = m$ for any $x \in \Lambda$. Moreover, for any $x \in \Lambda$ we have $E^u_\Lambda(x) = \mathrm{span}(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_x(\epsilon'_2))$, where $\epsilon'_2 > 0$ is as above, and there exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(x) \in (0, \epsilon_0)$ such that $E^u_\Lambda(y)$ depends continuously on $y \in W^s_\epsilon(x) \cap \Lambda$.*

Proof of Lemma 7.5. Set $m = \min_{x \in \Lambda} m_x$ and let $y \in \Lambda$ be such that $m_y = m$. Let $\epsilon = \epsilon(y) \in (0, \epsilon_2]$ be small enough so that $E^u_\Lambda(y) = \mathrm{span}(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_y(\delta))$ for all $\delta \in (0, \epsilon]$. Let $v_1, \ldots, v_m \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_y(\epsilon)$ be a linear basis in $E^u_\Lambda(y)$. Assume that $0 < \delta < \min\{\epsilon_2/6, \epsilon/6\}$, where $\epsilon_2 \in (0, \epsilon_1/(2C_1)]$ is as in the proof of Theorem 6.1. We will now use the map $G^y_x = (\exp^u_y)^{-1} \circ \exp^u_x : E^u(x;\epsilon_1) \longrightarrow E^u(y;\epsilon_0)$ and formula (6.10) from that proof.

Let $x \in \Lambda \cap W^u_\delta(y)$. We will show that $m_x \leq m$, so we must have $m_x = m$. Setting $\eta = (\exp^u_y)^{-1}(x)$, (6.10) holds for any $u \in E^u(x;\epsilon_2)$. Clearly $\eta \in \widehat{\Lambda}^u_y(\delta)$, so $F_y(\eta) \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_y(2\delta)$ (since by Theorem 6.1 (b), $\|F_y(\eta)\| \leq 2\|\eta\|$). Thus, $F_y(\eta)$ is a linear combination of the vectors $v_1,\ldots,v_m$. Given $u' \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_x(\delta)$, we have $u' = F_x(u)$ for some $u \in \widehat{\Lambda}^u_x(2\delta)$. Then $G^y_x(u) \in \widehat{\Lambda}^u_y(3\delta)$, so $F_y(G^y_x(u)) \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_y(6\delta) \subset \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_y(\epsilon)$, and therefore $F_y(G^y_x(u))$ is a linear combination of the vectors $v_1,\ldots,v_m$. Thus, $u' = F_x(u) = dG^x_y(\eta) \circ L_{y,\eta}\left(F_y \circ G^y_x(u) - F_y(\eta)\right)$ is a linear combination of the vectors $w_j = dG^x_y(\eta) \circ L_{y,\eta} \cdot v_j$ $(j = 1,\ldots,m)$, so $\dim(\mathrm{span}(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_x(\delta))) \leq m$. Hence $m_x \leq m$, and therefore $m_x = m$. Moreover, it follows from this argument that $\mathrm{span}(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_x(\delta)) = E^u_\Lambda(x)$ for any $x \in \Lambda \cap W^u_\delta(y)$ and any $0 < \delta < \min\{\epsilon_2/6, \epsilon/6\}$.

We now claim that $m_z = m$ for any $z \in \Lambda$. Assume that $m_z > m$ for some $z \in \Lambda$, and take $\epsilon' \in (0,\epsilon_2]$ so small that $\mathrm{span}(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_z(\epsilon'')) = E^u_\Lambda(z)$ for all $\epsilon'' \in (0,\epsilon']$. Let $u_1,\ldots,u_{m_z} \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_z(\epsilon')$ be a linear basis in $E^u_\Lambda(z)$. Take $\mu \in (0,\epsilon'_2]$ so small that for any $z' \in W^s_\mu(z) \cap \Lambda$ the vectors $u_j(z') = \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{z'}_z(u_j)$ $(j = 1,\ldots,m_z)$ are linearly independent in $E^u(z')$. By Corollary 7.4 these vectors belong to $\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_{z'}(\epsilon_2)$. Let $y \in \Lambda$ and $\epsilon = \epsilon(y) > 0$ be as above and let $0 < \delta < \min\{\epsilon_2/6, \epsilon/6\}$. It is well-known (see e.g. [KH]) that if $T > 0$ is sufficiently large, then $\phi_t(W^u_\delta(y)) \cap W^s_\mu(z) \neq \emptyset$ for any $t \geq T$. Take $T > 0$ with this property so that $e^{\alpha T}/C > \epsilon_2$. Then for some $x \in W^u_\delta(y) \cap \Lambda$ and some $t \geq T$ we have $z' = \phi_t(x) \in W^s_\mu(z) \cap \Lambda$. The choice of T and $t \geq T$ imply $d\phi_t(x)(E^u(x;\delta)) \supset E^u(z';\epsilon_2)$, so by Corollary 7.4, $d\phi_t(x)(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_x(\delta)) \supset \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_{z'}(\epsilon_2)$. Since $\dim(\mathrm{span}(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_x(\delta))) = m$, we now get $\dim(\mathrm{span}(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_{z'}(\epsilon_2))) = m$, a contradiction with the linear independence of the vectors $u_j(z') = \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{z'}_z(u_j)$ $(j = 1,\ldots,m_z)$ and $m_z > m$. Thus, $m_z = m$ for all $z \in \Lambda$.

Using the above notation (with $m_z = m$), by the previous argument, for any $z' \in W^s_\mu(z) \cap \Lambda$ the vectors $u_j(z') = \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^{z'}_z(u_j)$ $(j = 1,\ldots,m)$ provide a basis for $E^u_\Lambda(z')$, so the latter depends continuously on z'. Moreover, repeating the above argument we can see that $\dim(\mathrm{span}(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_z(\epsilon'_2))$ cannot exceed m, so we must have $\mathrm{span}(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_z(\epsilon'_2)) = E^u_\Lambda(z)$. The same argument can be applied to any $z'' \in W^s_\mu(z) \cap \Lambda$. ■

Proof of Lemma 7.2. Notice that if $x \in \Lambda$ and $z = x_p = f^{-p}(x)$ for some $p \geq 0$, then for any $\epsilon \in (0,\epsilon_2]$ we have

$$\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_z(\epsilon/2) \cap \widetilde{B}^u_p(z,\epsilon/2) \subset F_z(\widehat{\Lambda}^u_z(\epsilon) \cap \widehat{B}^u_p(z,\epsilon)) \subset \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_z(2\epsilon) \cap \widetilde{B}^u_p(z,2\epsilon)\ . \tag{7.2}$$

(a) Let $x \in \Lambda$. Given $y \in \Lambda$ and an integer $p \geq 0$, set $y_p = f^{-p}(y) \in \Lambda$. According to (7.2), it is enough to prove the following

Sublemma 7.6. *For any $0 < \delta \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon'_2/2$ there exist a constant $D = D(x,\delta,\epsilon) > 0$ and an open neighbourhood V_0 of x in $W^s_{\epsilon_0}(x) \cap \Lambda$ such that $\ell\left(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_{y_p}(\epsilon) \cap \widetilde{B}^u_p(y_p,\epsilon)\right) \leq D\,\ell\left(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_{y_p}(\delta) \cap \widetilde{B}^u_p(y_p,\delta)\right)$ for any $y \in V_0$ and any integer $p \geq 0$.*

Proof of Sublemma 7.6. Choose $\epsilon(x) \in (0,\epsilon'_2]$ so that $E^u_\Lambda(y)$ depends continuously on $y \in W^s_{\epsilon(x)}(x) \cap \Lambda$. For any $y \in W^s_{\epsilon(x)}(x) \cap \Lambda$ choose and fix an orthonormal basis $e_1(y), e_2(y),\ldots,e_m(y)$ in $E^u_\Lambda(y)$ which depends continuously on y.

Let $0 < \delta \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon'_2/2$. By the definition of $E^u_\Lambda(x)$ and Lemma 7.5, there exist $u_1, u_2,\ldots,u_m \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_x(\delta/2)$ which are linearly independent. Set $\Delta = \Delta(x,\delta) = \mathrm{Vol}_m[u_1,u_2,\ldots,u_m] > 0$, where $[u_1,u_2,\ldots,u_m]$ denotes the parallelepiped in $E^u_\Lambda(x)$ determined by the vectors $u_1,\ldots,u_m$, and

$u_j(y) = \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^y_x(u_j)$ for any $j = 1, \ldots, m$. Choose an open neighbourhood V_0 of x in $W^s_{\epsilon(x)}(x) \cap \Lambda$ such that

$$\mathrm{Vol}_m[u_1(y), u_2(y), \ldots, u_m(y)] \geq \frac{\Delta}{2} \quad , \quad y \in V_0 \ , \tag{7.3}$$

and

$$\frac{\|u_j\|}{2} \leq \|u_j(y)\| \leq 2\|u_j\| \quad , \quad y \in V_0 \ , \ 1 \leq j \leq m \ . \tag{7.4}$$

Then $u_j(y) \in \widehat{\Lambda}^u_y(\delta)$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, m$. Let $L_y = L(x, y, \delta) : E^u_\Lambda(y) \longrightarrow E^u_\Lambda(y)$ be the linear operator such that $L_y u_j(y) = e_j(y)$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, m$. It follows from (7.3) and (7.4) that there exists a constant $b = b(x, \delta) > 0$ (determined by Δ and $\|u_1\|, \ldots, \|u_m\|$) such that $\|L_y\| \leq b$ for all $y \in V_0$.

Fix for a moment $y \in V_0$. Consider an arbitrary integer $p \geq 1$ and set $z = f^{-p}(y) \in \Lambda$. Given $v \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_z(\epsilon) \cap \widetilde{B}^u_p(z, \epsilon)$, we have $\|d\hat{f}^p_z(0) \cdot v\| \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_2/2$, so by Corollary 7.4 and Lemma 7.5, we have $u = d\hat{f}^p_z(0) \cdot v \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_y(\epsilon) \subset E^u_\Lambda(y)$. Consequently, $u = \sum_{s=1}^m c_s\, u_s(y)$ for some real numbers c_s, so $L_y u = \sum_{s=1}^m c_s L_y(u_s(y)) = \sum_{s=1}^m c_s e_s(y)$. Thus, $\sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^m c_s^2} = \|L_y u\| \leq \|L_y\|\, \|u\| \leq \epsilon\, b$, and so $|c_s| \leq \epsilon\, b$ for all $s = 1, \ldots, m$. Since $v_j = d\hat{f}_y^{-p}(0) \cdot u_j(y) \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_z(\delta) \cap \widetilde{B}^u_p(z, \delta)$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, m$, it now follows that

$$\|v\| = \|d\hat{f}_y^{-p}(0) \cdot u\| = \left\| \sum_{s=1}^m c_s\, d\hat{f}_y^{-p}(0) \cdot u_s(y) \right\| \leq m\, \epsilon\, b \max_{1 \leq s \leq m} \|v_s\| \leq m\, \epsilon\, b\, \ell(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_z(\delta) \cap \widetilde{B}^u_p(z, \delta)) \ .$$

Hence $\ell\left(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_z(\epsilon) \cap \widetilde{B}^u_p(z, \epsilon)\right) \leq D\, \ell\left(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_z(\delta) \cap \widetilde{B}^u_p(z, \delta)\right)$, where $D = D(x, \delta, \epsilon) = m\, \epsilon\, b$. This concludes the proof of the Sublemma and thus the proof of part (a) in Lemma 7.2.

Proof of Lemma 7.2(b). We will essentially repeat the argument in the proof of Sublemma 7.6. As before, it is enough to prove the analogous statement for sets of the form $\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_{f^{-p}(x)}(\epsilon) \cap \widetilde{B}^u_p(f^{-p}(x), \epsilon)$.

Choose $\epsilon(x)$ as before and for each $y \in W^u_{\epsilon(x)}(x) \cap \Lambda$ an orthonormal basis $\{e_j(y)\}$ in $E^u_\Lambda(y)$ depending continuously on y. Let $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon'_2/2$ and $\rho \in (0, 1)$. As in the proof of the Sublemma, there exists a basis $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_m$ in $E^u_\Lambda(x)$ with $u_j \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_x(\epsilon/2)$ for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Let $L_y = L(x, \epsilon) : E^u_\Lambda(y) \longrightarrow E^u_\Lambda(y)$ be the linear operator such that $L_y u_j(y) = e_j(y)$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, m$, where $u_j(y)$ are defined as in the proof of the Sublemma. Choose V_0 and $b = b(x, \epsilon) > 0$ as before, replacing δ by ϵ. Let $0 < \delta \leq \min\left\{\epsilon, \frac{\rho}{m\, b}\right\}$. Then given $y \in V_0$ and an integer $p \geq 1$, set $z = f^{-p}(y) \in \Lambda$. As in the proof of the Sublemma, for $v \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^u_z(\delta) \cap \widetilde{B}^u_p(z, \delta)$ one obtains $\|v\| \leq m\, \delta\, b\, \ell(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_z(\epsilon) \cap \widetilde{B}^u_p(z, \epsilon))$. Thus, $\ell(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_z(\delta) \cap \widetilde{B}^u_p(z, \delta)) \leq \rho\, \ell(\widetilde{\Lambda}^u_z(\epsilon) \cap \widetilde{B}^u_p(z, \epsilon))$. ■

8 The lower unstable pinching condition

Let again M be a C^2 complete Riemann manifold, ϕ_t be a C^2 flow on M, and let Λ a basic set for ϕ_t. Throughout we assume that ϕ_t and Λ satisfy the following *lower unstable pinching condition*:

(LUPC): *There exist constants* $C > 0$ *and* $0 < \alpha \leq \beta < \alpha_2 \leq \beta_2$*, and for every* $x \in \Lambda$ *constants* $\alpha_1(x) \leq \beta_1(x)$ *with* $\alpha \leq \alpha_1(x) \leq \beta_1(x) \leq \beta$ *and* $2\alpha_1(x) - \beta_1(x) \geq \alpha$ *and a* $d\phi_t$*-invariant splitting* $E^u(x) = E^u_1(x) \oplus E^u_2(x)$*, continuous with respect to* $x \in \Lambda$*, such that*

$$\frac{1}{C}\, e^{\alpha_1(x)\, t}\, \|u\| \leq \|d\phi_t(x) \cdot u\| \leq C\, e^{\beta_1(x)\, t}\, \|u\| \quad , \quad u \in E^u_1(x) \ , t > 0 \ ,$$

and

$$\frac{1}{C}\, e^{\alpha_2\, t}\, \|u\| \leq \|d\phi_t(x) \cdot u\| \leq C\, e^{\beta_2\, t}\, \|u\| \quad , \quad u \in E^u_2(x) \ , t > 0 \ .$$

Clearly the pinching condition (P) from Sect. 6 is (LUPC) in the special case when $E^u_2(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \Lambda$. In (LUPC) the lower part of the spectrum of $d\phi_t$ over E^u is (point-wisely) pinched, however there is no restriction on the rest of the spectrum, except that it should be uniformly separated from the lower part.

Under the above condition the distribution $E^u_2(x)$ $(x \in \Lambda)$ is integrable (see e.g. [Pes]), so (assuming $\epsilon_0 > 0$ is small enough) there exists a ϕ_t-invariant family $W^{u,2}_{\epsilon_0}(x)$ $(x \in \Lambda)$ of C^2 submanifolds of $W^u_{\epsilon_0}(x)$ such that $T_x(W^{u,2}_{\epsilon_0}(x)) = E^u_2(x)$ for all $x \in \Lambda$. Moreover (see Theorem 6.1 in [HPS] or the proof of Theorem B in [PSW]), for any $x \in \Lambda$, the map $\Lambda \cap W^u_{\epsilon_0}(x) \ni y \mapsto E^u_2(y)$ is C^1. However in general the distribution $E^u_1(x)$ $(x \in \Lambda)$ does not have to be integrable (see [Pes]).

In this section we make the additional assumption that $E^u_1(x)$ $(x \in \Lambda)$ is integrable:

(I): *There exist* $\epsilon_0 > 0$ *and a* ϕ_t*-invariant family* $W^{u,1}_{\epsilon_0}(x)$ $(x \in \Lambda)$ *of* C^2 *submanifolds of* $W^u_{\epsilon_0}(x)$ *such that* $T_x(W^{u,1}_{\epsilon_0}(x)) = E^u_1(x)$ *for all* $x \in \Lambda$*, and moreover for any* $\epsilon > 0$ *and any* $x \in \Lambda$, $\Lambda \cap W^u_\epsilon(x)$ *is* **not** *contained in* $W^{u,2}_\epsilon(x)$*.*

Roughly speaking, the latter means that the distribution $E^u_1(x)$ 'plays an essential role' in the dynamics of the flow over Λ.

Our aim in this section is to prove the following.

Theorem 8.1. *Let* ϕ_t *and* Λ *satisfy the conditions* (LUPC) *and* (I)*. Then* ϕ_t *has a regular distortion along unstable manifolds over* Λ*.*

Clearly this theorem is much more general than Theorem 7.1. Its proof is a simple generalization of what we did under the pinching condition (P) in Sects. 6 and 7. As before, given $x \in \Lambda$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we have to deal with diameters of sets of the form $f^{-p}(\Lambda \cap B(x,\epsilon))$ $(p \geq 1)$, where $f = \phi_{t_0}$ for some sufficiently large $t_0 > 0$. Obviously, going backwards along the flow, the greatest expansion occurs in the direction of vectors in E^u_1, so the diameter of $f^{-p}(\Lambda \cap B(x,\epsilon))$ would be comparable with that of its 'projection' $\pi^{u,1}(f^{-p}(\Lambda \cap B(x,\epsilon)))$ to the corresponding leaf of $W^{u,1}$ (see Lemma 8.2 below). The behaviour of $d\phi_t$ on E^u_1 (and that of ϕ_t on $W^{u,1}$) is very similar to what we had in Sects. 6 and 7, and we use the arguments from there to compare diameters of sets of the form $\pi^{u,1}(f^{-p}(\Lambda \cap B(x,\epsilon)))$.

We now proceed with the proof of Theorem 8.1. So, we assume that ϕ_t and Λ satisfy the conditions (LUPC) and (I).

Notice that, since the splitting $E^u_1(x) \oplus E^u_2(x)$ depends continuously on x and Λ is compact, the angle between $E^u_1(x)$ and $E^u_2(x)$ is uniformly bounded below by a positive constant. So, the local submanifolds $W^{u,1}_{\epsilon_0}(x)$ and $W^{u,2}_{\epsilon_0}(x)$ of $W^u_{\epsilon_0}(x)$ are (uniformly) transversal. Moreover, taking $\epsilon_1 \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ and $\epsilon_2 \in (0, \epsilon_1]$ sufficiently small, for any $y, z \in W^u_{\epsilon_1}(x) \cap \Lambda$ with $d(y,z) \leq \epsilon_2$, the submanifolds $W^{u,1}_{\epsilon_1}(y)$ and $W^{u,2}_{\epsilon_1}(z)$ of $W^u_{\epsilon_0}(x)$ are transversal and of complementary dimension, and intersect at a single point $[y,z]^u_x = W^{u,1}_{\epsilon_1}(y) \cap W^{u,2}_{\epsilon_1}(z)$. It follows immediately that the so defined local product has the usual invariance, namely $\phi_t([y,z]^u_x) = [\phi_t(y), \phi_t(z)]^u_{\phi_t(x)}$ for $t \leq 0$. However, **in general** $[y,z]^u_x$ **does not have to belong to** Λ. We can now define the *projection* $\pi^{u,1}_x : W^u_{\epsilon_2}(x) \cap \Lambda \longrightarrow W^{u,1}_{\epsilon_1}(x)$ *along* $W^{u,2}$ by $\pi^{u,1}_x(y) = [x,y]^u_x$.

In what follows for any $u \in E^u(x)$, $x \in \Lambda$, we will use the notation $u = u_1 + u_2$, where $u_i \in E^u_i(x)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Setting $\|u\|' = \max\{\|u_1\|, \|u_2\|\}$ defines a norm on $E^u(x)$ equivalent to the original norm $\|u\|$ defined by the Riemann metric on M. For a non-empty subset X of $E^u(x)$ let $\mathrm{diam}'(X)$ be the *diameter* of X with respect to $\|\cdot\|'$.

Fix an arbitrary and sufficiently large $t_0 > 0$ as in Sect. 6 and set $f = \phi_{t_0}$. Then f is a partially hyperbolic diffeomorphism with respect to the invariant splitting $E(x) = E^s(x) \oplus (E^0(x) \oplus E^u_1(x)) \oplus E^u_2(x)$ with $E^c(x) = E^0(x) \oplus E^u_1(x)$, and it follows from Theorem A' in

[PSW] that the local holonomy maps along the lamination $W^{u,2}$ through Λ are θ-Hölder for some sufficiently small $\theta > 0$. In particular, the projections $\pi_x^{u,1}$ are uniformly continuous, and it follows from this that if $\{x_m\}$ and $\{y_m\}$ are sequences in Λ with $y_m \in W^u_{\epsilon_2}(x_m)$ for all m, $x_m \to x \in \Lambda$ and $y_m \to y \in W^u_{\epsilon_2}(x)$ as $m \to \infty$, then $\pi^{u,1}_{x_m}(y_m) \to \pi^{u,1}_x(y)$ as $m \to \infty$.

Assuming that $\epsilon_0 > 0$ is sufficiently small, for each $x \in \Lambda$ there exists a C^2 diffeomorphism $\Phi_x : E^u(x;\epsilon_0) \longrightarrow W^u_{\epsilon_0}(x)$ such that $(\Phi_x)_{|E^u_i(x;\epsilon_0)} : E^u_i(x;\epsilon_0) \longrightarrow W^{u,i}_{\epsilon_0}(x)$ is the corresponding exponential map for $i = 1, 2$. We can choose Φ_x in such a way that the diffeomorphism $(\exp^u_x)^{-1} \circ \Phi_x$ has uniformly bounded derivatives, so in particular if $C > 0$ is sufficiently large, then $\frac{1}{C}\|u-v\| \leq d(\Phi_x(u), \Phi_x(v)) \leq C\|u-v\|$ for all $x \in \Lambda$, $u, v \in E^u(x;\epsilon_0)$. Moreover, since the leaves of the distribution $W^{u,2}$ are C^1 in W^u, assuming again that $\epsilon_0 > 0$, $\epsilon_1 \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ and $\epsilon_2 \in (0, \epsilon_1]$ are sufficiently small and the constant $C > 0$ is sufficiently large, for every $x \in \Lambda$ and every $y \in \Lambda \cap W^u_{\epsilon_2}(x)$ we have

$$\frac{\|v_1\|}{C} \leq d(\pi^{u,1}_x(y), x) \leq C\|v_1\| \quad , \quad v = (v_1, v_2) = (\Phi_x)^{-1}(y) . \tag{8.1}$$

Next, assuming that $\epsilon_1 \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ is sufficiently small for any $x \in \Lambda$ the map

$$\hat{f}_x = (\Phi_{f(x)})^{-1} \circ f \circ \Phi_x : E^u(x;\epsilon_1) \longrightarrow E^u(f(x);\epsilon_0)$$

is well-defined and therefore C^2. It is important to notice that

$$\hat{f}_x(E^u_i(x;\epsilon_1)) \subset E^u_i(f(x);\epsilon_0) \quad , \quad i = 1, 2.$$

As in Sect. 6, for any $y \in \Lambda$ and any integer $k \geq 1$ we will use the notation

$$\hat{f}^k_y = \hat{f}_{f^{k-1}(y)} \circ \ldots \circ \hat{f}_{f(y)} \circ \hat{f}_y \quad , \quad \hat{f}^{-k}_y = (\hat{f}_{f^{-k}(y)})^{-1} \circ \ldots \circ (\hat{f}_{f^{-2}(y)})^{-1} \circ (\hat{f}_{f^{-1}(y)})^{-1} ,$$

at any point where these sequences of maps are well-defined. Finally, for $x \in \Lambda$ and $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0]$ set

$$\widehat{\Lambda}^u_x(\epsilon) = \{u \in E^u(x;\epsilon) : \Phi_x(u) \in \Lambda\} .$$

As before we have $\hat{f}^{-1}_x(\widehat{\Lambda}^u_x(\epsilon)) \subset \widehat{\Lambda}^u_{f^{-1}(x)}(\epsilon)$.

Lemma 8.2. *For any $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_1]$ there exists $\omega_\epsilon > 0$ such that for every $x \in \Lambda$ there exists $u \in \widehat{\Lambda}^u_x(\epsilon)$ with $\|u_1\| \geq \omega_\epsilon$.*

Proof. Let $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_1]$. According to (8.1), it is enough to show that there exists $\omega'_\epsilon > 0$ such that for every $x \in \Lambda$ there exists $y \in \Lambda \cap W^u_{\epsilon_1}(x)$ with $d(x, \pi^{u,1}_x(y)) \geq \omega'_\epsilon$. Assuming this is not so, for every integer $m \geq 1$ there exists $x_m \in \Lambda$ with $d(x_m, \pi^{u,1}_{x_m}(y)) \leq 1/m$ for all $y \in \Lambda \cap W^u_\epsilon(x_m)$. We may assume $x_m \to x \in \Lambda$ as $m \to \infty$. The condition (I) implies that there exists $y \in \Lambda \cap W^u_{\epsilon/2}(x) \setminus W^{u,2}_{\epsilon/2}(x)$. Then $z = \pi^{u,1}_x(y) \neq x$. Setting $y_m = \mathcal{H}^{x_m}_x(y)$, where $\mathcal{H}^{x_m}_x$ is the local stable holonomy map (see Sect. 7), we have $y_m \in \Lambda \cap W^u_\epsilon(x_m)$ for all sufficiently large m and $y_m \to y$ as $m \to \infty$. Hence $\pi^{u,1}_{x_m}(y_m) \to \pi^{u,1}_x(y) = z$, so for all sufficiently large m we have $d(\pi^{u,1}_{x_m}(y_m), x_m) > d(z, x)/2 > 0$. This is a contradiction with $d(\pi^{u,1}_{x_m}(y_m), x_m) \leq 1/m$ implicated by the choice of x_m. ■

Next, for any $y \in \Lambda$, $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_2]$ and $p \geq 1$ set

$$\check{B}^{u,1}_p(y, \epsilon) = \{v_1 \in E^u_1(y;\epsilon) : \exists v = (v_1, v_2) \in \widehat{\Lambda}^u_y(\epsilon) \text{ with } \|\hat{f}^p_y(v)\|' \leq \epsilon\} ,$$

and $\widehat{B}^u_p(y,\epsilon) = \{v \in E^u(y;\epsilon) : \|\hat{f}^p_y(v)\|' \leq \epsilon\}$. Clearly,

$$\mathrm{diam}'(\check{B}^{u,1}_p(y,\epsilon)) \leq \mathrm{diam}'(\widehat{B}^u_p(y,\epsilon) \cap \widehat{\Lambda}^u_y(\epsilon)) \ . \tag{8.2}$$

The following consequence of Lemma 8.2 is derived by using some well-known arguments (see e.g. Appendix A.1 in [BR]).

Lemma 8.3. *Choosing $\epsilon_1 > 0$ sufficiently small, for any $\epsilon \in (0,\epsilon_1]$ there exists an integer $p_\epsilon \geq 1$ such that*

$$\mathrm{diam}'(\widehat{B}^u_p(y,\epsilon) \cap \widehat{\Lambda}^u_y(\epsilon)) \leq \mathrm{diam}'(\check{B}^{u,1}_p(y,\epsilon)) \tag{8.3}$$

for every $y \in \Lambda$ and every integer $p \geq p_\epsilon$.

Proof. Fix constants $\lambda_1 < \mu_2$ such that $e^{\beta\, t_0} < \lambda_1 < \mu_2 < e^{\alpha_2\, t_0}$. Using Taylor's formula, there exists a constant $D > 0$ such that

$$\|\hat{f}^{-1}_x(u) - \hat{f}^{-1}_x(v) - d\hat{f}^{-1}_x(v)\cdot(u-v)\| \leq D\,\|u-v\|^2 \quad , \quad x \in \Lambda \ , \ u,v \in E^u(x;\epsilon_0) \ . \tag{8.4}$$

Take $\epsilon_1 \in (0,\epsilon_0]$ such that $D\epsilon_1 < \min\{1/\mu_2 - e^{-\alpha_2 t_0} \ , \ e^{-\beta t_0} - 1/\lambda_1\}$. Given $\epsilon \in (0,\epsilon_1]$, let $\omega_\epsilon > 0$ be as in Lemma 8.2 and let $p_\epsilon \geq 1$ be the least integer so that $(\mu_2/\lambda_1)^{p_\epsilon} \geq \epsilon/\omega_\epsilon$.

Setting $\hat{f}^{-1}_x(u) = ((\hat{f}^{-1}_x)^{(1)}(u), (\hat{f}^{-1}_x)^{(2)}(u))$, for any $x \in \Lambda$ and $u \in E^u(x;\epsilon_0)$, (8.4) implies

$$\hat{f}^{-1}_x(u) - \hat{f}^{-1}_x(u_1,0) = d\hat{f}^{-1}_x(u_1,0)\cdot(0,u_2) + v \ ,$$

where $\|v\| \leq D\,\|u_2\|^2$. Comparing the E^u_2-coordinates and using the choice of ϵ_1 gives

$$\|(\hat{f}^{-1}_x)^{(2)}(u)\| \leq \|d\hat{f}^{-1}_x(u_1,0)\cdot(0,u_2)\| + \|v_2\| \leq \frac{\|u_2\|}{e^{\alpha_2 t_0}} + D\|u_2\|^2 \leq \frac{\|u_2\|}{\mu_2} \ .$$

In a similar way one gets $\|(\hat{f}^{-1}_x)^{(1)}(u)\| \geq \dfrac{\|u_1\|}{\lambda_1}$.

Let $y \in \Lambda$ and $p \geq p_\epsilon$ be an integer. Let $w = (w_1,w_2) \in \widehat{B}^u_p(y,\epsilon) \cap \widehat{\Lambda}^u_y(\epsilon)$ be such that $\|w\|'$ is the maximal possible. Since $w_1 \in \check{B}^{u,1}_p(y,\epsilon)$, if $\|w_1\| \geq \|w_2\|$, then $\|w_1\| \geq \|w\|'$, and so (8.3) is trivially satisfied in this case.

Assume that $\|w_1\| < \|w_2\|$; then $\|w\|' = \|w_2\|$. Set $x = f^p(y)$ and $\zeta = \hat{f}^p_y(w)$; then $\zeta \in \widehat{\Lambda}^u_x(\epsilon)$. By Lemma 8.2 there exists $u \in \widehat{\Lambda}^u_x(\epsilon)$ with $\|u_1\| \geq \omega_\epsilon$. Now $\|\zeta\| \leq \epsilon$ implies $\|u_1\| \geq (\omega_\epsilon/\epsilon)\,\|\zeta_2\|$, and it follows from above that

$$\|(\hat{f}^{-1}_x)^{(1)}(u)\| \geq \frac{\|u_1\|}{\lambda_1} \geq \frac{(\omega_\epsilon/\epsilon)\|\zeta_2\|}{\lambda_1} \geq (\omega_\epsilon/\epsilon)\left(\frac{\mu_2}{\lambda_1}\right)\|(\hat{f}^{-1}_x)^{(2)}(\zeta)\| \ .$$

Using this argument by induction, for $v = \hat{f}^{-p}_x(u) \in \widehat{B}^u_p(y,\epsilon)\cap\widehat{\Lambda}^u_y(\epsilon)$ we get $\|v_1\| \geq (\omega_\epsilon/\epsilon)\,(\mu_2/\lambda_1)^p\,\|w_2\| \geq \|w_2\|$. Thus, $\mathrm{diam}'(\check{B}^{u,1}_p(y,\epsilon)) \geq \|v_1\| \geq \|w\|' = \mathrm{diam}'(\widehat{B}^u_p(y,\epsilon) \cap \widehat{\Lambda}^u_y(\epsilon))$. ■

To prove Theorem 8.1, it remains to compare diameters of sets of the form $\check{B}^{u,1}_p(y,\epsilon)$. As in Sect. 7, the main step is the following lemma whose proof follows the arguments from Sects. 6 and 7 with some small modifications. For completeness we sketch its proof in Appendix B omitting most of the details.

Lemma 8.4. *There exists a constant $\epsilon_3 \in (0,\epsilon_2]$ with the following properties:*

(a) *For any $x \in \Lambda$ and any $0 < \delta \le \epsilon \le \epsilon_3$ there exist a constant $R = R(x,\delta,\epsilon) > 0$ and an open neighbourhood $V_0 = V_0(x,\delta)$ of x in $W^s_{\epsilon_0}(x) \cap \Lambda$ such that*

$$\operatorname{diam}\left(\check{B}^{u,1}_p(f^{-p}(y),\epsilon)\right) \le R \operatorname{diam}\left(\check{B}^{u,1}_p(f^{-p}(y),\delta)\right) \tag{8.5}$$

for any $y \in V_0$ and any integer $p \ge 1$.

(b) *For any $x \in \Lambda$ and any $0 < \epsilon \le \epsilon_3$ there exists an open neighbourhood $V_0 = V_0(x,\epsilon)$ of x in $W^s_{\epsilon_0}(x) \cap \Lambda$ with the following property: for any $\rho \in (0,1)$ there exists $\delta \in (0,\epsilon]$ such that for any $y \in V_0$ and any integer $p \ge 1$ we have* $\operatorname{diam}\left(\check{B}^{u,1}_p(f^{-p}(y),\delta)\right) \le \rho \operatorname{diam}\left(\check{B}^{u,1}_p(f^{-p}(y),\epsilon)\right)$.

Proof of Theorem 8.1. As in Sect. 7, we first derive the existence of a constant $\hat{\epsilon}_0 \in (0,\epsilon_3]$ with the following properties:

(i) For any $x \in \Lambda$ and any $0 < \delta \le \epsilon \le \hat{\epsilon}_0$ there exist a constant $R_x = R(x,\delta,\epsilon) > 0$ and an open neighbourhood $\mathcal{O}_x$ of x in Λ such that $\ell\left(\check{B}^{u,1}_T(z,\epsilon)\right) \le R_x\, \ell\left(\check{B}^{u,1}_T(z,\delta)\right)$ for any $z \in \Lambda$ and $T > 0$ with $\phi_T(z) \in \mathcal{O}_x$. Here

$$\check{B}^{u,1}_T(z,\epsilon) = \{v_1 \in E^u_1(z;\epsilon) : \exists v = (v_1,v_2) \in \widehat{\Lambda}^u_z(\epsilon) \text{ with } \|\Phi^{-1}_{\phi_T(z)} \circ \phi_T \circ \Phi_z(v)\|' \le \epsilon\} \;.$$

(ii) For any $x \in \Lambda$, any $0 < \epsilon \le \hat{\epsilon}_0$ and any $\rho \in (0,1)$ there exist $\delta \in (0,\epsilon)$ and an open neighbourhood $\mathcal{O}_x$ of x in Λ such that $\ell\left(\check{B}^{u,1}_T(z,\delta)\right) \le \rho\, \ell\left(\check{B}^{u,1}_T(z,\epsilon)\right)$ for any $z \in \Lambda$ and $T > 0$ with $\phi_T(z) \in \mathcal{O}_x$.

We now proceed as in Sect. 7 to derive Theorem 7.1 from Lemma 7.3. ■

9 Non-integrability conditions

The *non-integrability condition* of Chernov [Ch1] and Dolgopyat [D2] can be stated as follows:

(UNI) : There exist constants $\omega_2 \ge \omega_1 > 0$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $z \in \Lambda$, $x \in \Lambda \cap W^u_{\epsilon_0}(z)$ and $y \in \Lambda \cap W^s_{\epsilon_0}(z)$ we have $\omega_1\, d(z,x)\, d(z,y) \le |\Delta(x,y)| \le \omega_2\, d(z,x)\, d(z,y)$.

It is easy to see that (UNI) implies (LNIC) with $\theta_0 = 1$. Indeed, given an arbitrary $z_0 \in \Lambda$ and any $\hat{z} \in \Lambda \cap W^u_{\epsilon_0}(z_0)$, assume $b \in E^u(\hat{z})$ is an arbitrary tangent vector to Λ at $\hat{z}$ with $\|b\| = 1$. Set $\tilde{z} = \hat{z}$ and choose an arbitrary $\tilde{y} \in \Lambda \cap W^s_{\epsilon_0}(\tilde{z}) \setminus \{\tilde{z}\}$ close to $\tilde{z}$. Since $\pi_{\tilde{y}}(z) = [z,\tilde{y}] \to \tilde{y}$ as $z \to \tilde{z}$, there exists $\epsilon' \in (0,\epsilon_0)$ such that for any $z \in W^u_{\epsilon'}(\tilde{z}) \cap \Lambda$ we have $d(z,\pi_{\tilde{y}}(z)) \ge \frac{1}{2} d(\tilde{z},\tilde{y})$. Given such $\epsilon' > 0$ and $z \in W^u_{\epsilon'}(\tilde{z}) \cap \Lambda$, for any $x = \exp^u_z(v)$ with $v \in E^u(z)$, $\|v\| < \epsilon'$, (UNI) implies

$$|\Delta(x,\pi_{\tilde{y}}(z))| \ge \omega_1\, d(x,z)\, d(z,\pi_{\tilde{y}}(z)) \ge \omega_1\, d(x,z)\, \frac{d(\tilde{z},\tilde{y})}{2} = \delta\, \|v\| \;,$$

with $\delta = \frac{\omega_1\, d(\tilde{z},\tilde{y})}{2}$. This proves (LNIC).

Next, assume that ϕ_t is a C^2 contact flow on M with a C^2 invariant contact form ω. The following condition says that $d\omega$ is in some sense non-degenerate on the 'tangent space' of Λ near some of its points:

(ND): *There exist $z_0 \in \Lambda$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $\mu_0 > 0$ such that for any $\hat{z} \in \Lambda \cap W^u_\epsilon(z_0)$ and any unit vector $b \in E^u(\hat{z})$ tangent to Λ at $\hat{z}$ there exist $\tilde{z} \in \Lambda \cap W^u_\epsilon(z_0)$ arbitrarily close to $\hat{z}$ and a unit vector $a \in E^s(\tilde{z})$ tangent to Λ at $\tilde{z}$ with $|d\omega_{\tilde{z}}(a,b_{\tilde{z}})| \ge \mu_0$, where $b_{\tilde{z}}$ is the parallel translate of b along the geodesic in $W^u_\epsilon(z_0)$ from $\hat{z}$ to $\tilde{z}$.*

Proposition 9.1. *For contact flows ϕ_t with Lipschitz local stable holonomy maps, the condition* (ND) *implies* (LNIC).

Since (ND) is always satisfied when $\dim(M) = 3$ or $\Lambda = M$, we get the following.

Corollary 9.2. *For contact flows ϕ_t with either $\dim(M) = 3$ (and an arbitrary basic set Λ) or $\Lambda = M$ the condition* (LNIC) *is always satisfied on Λ.* ■

To prove Lemma 9.1 we will make use of the following lemma which can be derived from the proof of Lemma 3.2 in [KB] (see also Lemma B.7 in [L2]).

Lemma 9.3. ([KB]) *Let ϕ_t be a contact flow on M with a contact form ω and let Λ be a basic set for ϕ_t with Lipschitz local (un)stable holonomy maps. Then for every $\tilde{z} \in \Lambda$ and every $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ there exists $\tilde{\epsilon} \in (0, \epsilon_0)$ such that for any $z \in \Lambda \cap W^u_{\tilde{\epsilon}}(\tilde{z})$, any $x \in W^u_{\tilde{\epsilon}}(z) \cap \Lambda$ and any $y \in W^s_{\tilde{\epsilon}}(z) \cap \Lambda$ we have $|\Delta(x, y) - d\omega_z(u, v)| \leq \tilde{\delta}\, \|u\|\, \|v\|$, where $u \in E^u(z)$ and $v \in E^s(z)$ are such that $\exp^u_z(u) = x$ and $\exp^s_z(v) = y$.*

Fix an arbitrary constant θ_0 such that

$$1 - \frac{\mu_0^2}{32\, C^2} \leq \theta_0 < 1 \; . \tag{9.1}$$

Proof of Lemma 9.1. Assume that Λ is a basic set for a contact flow ϕ_t such that (ND) holds on Λ. Let $z_0 \in \Lambda$, $1 > \epsilon_0 > \epsilon > 0$ and $\mu_0 > 0$ be as in the statement of (ND) above. Fix a constant $C > 0$ with $|d\omega_z(u, v)| \leq C\, \|u\|\, \|v\|$ for all $z \in \Lambda$ and $u, v \in T_z M$.

To check (LNIC), consider an arbitrary $\hat{z} \in \Lambda \cap W^u_\epsilon(z_0)$, and let $b \in E^u(\hat{z})$ be an arbitrary tangent vector to Λ at $\hat{z}$ with $\|b\| = 1$. It follows from the condition (ND) that there exist $\tilde{z} \in \Lambda \cap W^u_\epsilon(z_0)$ arbitrarily close to $\hat{z}$ and a unit vector $a \in E^s(\tilde{z})$ tangent to Λ at $\tilde{z}$ such that

$$|d\omega_{\tilde{z}}(a, b_{\tilde{z}})| \geq \mu_0 \; . \tag{9.2}$$

Since a is tangent to Λ at $\tilde{z}$, there exists $w \in E^s(\tilde{z}; \epsilon)$ with an arbitrarily small $\|w\| \in (0, 1)$ such that $\tilde{y} = \exp^s_{\tilde{z}}(w) \in \Lambda$ and

$$\|w/\|w\| - a\| < \frac{\mu_0}{4\, C} \; . \tag{9.3}$$

Fix w with (9.3) such that $\|w\| < \min\{\epsilon/2, \frac{\mu_0}{32\, C}\}$, and set $\tilde{\delta} = \frac{\mu_0\, \|w\|}{12}$.

Given any $z \in \Lambda \cap W^u_\epsilon(\tilde{z})$ close to $\tilde{z}$, there exists a unique $w(z) \in E^s(z)$ such that $\pi_{\tilde{y}}(z) = \exp^s_z(w(z))$. Clearly $w(z)$ is a continuous function of z with $w(\tilde{z}) = w$. Take $0 < \tilde{\epsilon} \leq \min\left\{\epsilon, \frac{\mu_0}{16C\|w\|}\right\}$ so small that the conclusion of Lemma 9.3 holds and moreover $\|w(z)\| < \epsilon$ and $\|w\|/2 \leq \|w(z)\| \leq 2\|w\|$ for all $z \in \Lambda \cap W^u_{\tilde{\epsilon}}(\tilde{z})$.

We will now use parallel translation on the Riemann manifold $W^u_{\epsilon_0}(z_0)$. For any $z \in W^u_{\tilde{\epsilon}}(\tilde{z})$ let $\Gamma_z : E^u(z) \longrightarrow E^u(\tilde{z})$ be the parallel translation along the geodesic in $W^u_{\epsilon_0}(z_0)$ from z to $\tilde{z}$. Then Γ_z is an isometry which is Lipschitz in z and $\Gamma_{\tilde{z}} = \mathrm{id}$. Since the form $d\omega_z$ is C^1 in z and $w(z) \to w$ as $z \to \tilde{z}$, taking $\tilde{\epsilon} > 0$ sufficiently small, for any $z \in W^u_\epsilon(\tilde{z}) \cap \Lambda$ with $d(z, \tilde{z}) < \tilde{\epsilon}$ we have

$$|d\omega_z(v, w(z)) - d\omega_{\tilde{z}}(\Gamma_z(v), w)| \leq \tilde{\delta}\, \|v\| \quad , \quad v \in E^u(z; \tilde{\epsilon}) \; . \tag{9.4}$$

Moreover we can take $\tilde{\epsilon} > 0$ so small that $\|\Gamma_z(b_z) - b_{\tilde{z}}\| \leq \tilde{\delta}$ for any $z \in W^u_\epsilon(\tilde{z}) \cap \Lambda$ with $d(z, \tilde{z}) < \tilde{\epsilon}$.

Let $z \in \Lambda \cap W^u_{\epsilon_0}(\tilde{z})$, $d(z, \tilde{z}) < \tilde{\epsilon}$, and let $v \in E^u(\tilde{z})$, be such that $\exp^u_z(v) \in \Lambda$, $\|v\| < \tilde{\epsilon}$, and $\langle v/\|v\|, b_z\rangle \geq \theta_0$. Setting $\tilde{v} = \Gamma_z(v)$ and $\tilde{b} = \Gamma_z(b_z)$, we have $\|\tilde{v}\| = \|v\|$, $\|\tilde{b}\| = 1$, $\langle \tilde{v}, \tilde{b}\rangle = \langle v, b_z\rangle$

and $\|\tilde{b} - b_{\tilde{z}}\| < \tilde{\delta}$. Thus, $\langle \tilde{v}/\|\tilde{v}\|, \tilde{b}\rangle = \langle v/\|v\|, b\rangle \geq \theta_0$. Using Lemma 9.3, (9.4), (9.3) and $\tilde{\delta} < \frac{\mu_0}{8}$ (which follows from the choice of $\tilde{\delta}$) we now get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Delta(\exp^u_z(v), \pi_{\tilde{y}}(z))| &= |\Delta(\exp^u_z(v), \exp^s_z(w(z))| \geq |d\omega_z(v, w(z))| - \tilde{\delta}\,\|v\|\,\|w(z)\| \\
&\geq \|w\| \left[|d\omega_{\tilde{z}}(\tilde{v}, a)| - \frac{\mu_0}{4}\,\|\tilde{v}\| \right] - \tilde{\delta}\,\|v\| - \frac{\mu_0}{4}\,\|v\|\,\|w\| \\
&= \|w\|\,|d\omega_{\tilde{z}}(\tilde{v}, a)| - \tilde{\delta}\,\|v\| - \frac{\mu_0}{2}\,\|v\|\,\|w\| \ .
\end{aligned}$$

Next, $\langle \tilde{v}/\|\tilde{v}\|, \tilde{b}\rangle \geq \theta_0$ and (9.1) yield $\|\tilde{v}/\|\tilde{v}\| - \tilde{b}\|^2 = 2 - 2\langle \tilde{v}/\|\tilde{v}\|, \tilde{b}\rangle \leq 2(1-\theta_0) \leq \frac{\mu_0^2}{16\,C^2}$, so $\|\tilde{v}/\|\tilde{v}\| - \tilde{b}\| \leq \frac{\mu_0}{4\,C}$, and therefore $\|\tilde{v}/\|\tilde{v}\| - b_{\tilde{z}}\| \leq \tilde{\delta} + \frac{\mu_0}{4\,C}$. Now the above, (9.2) and the choice of $\tilde{\delta}$ imply

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Delta(\exp^u_z(v), \pi_{\tilde{y}}(z))| &\geq \|w\|\,\|\tilde{v}\| \left[|d\omega_{\tilde{z}}(b_{\tilde{z}}, a)| - C\tilde{\delta} - \frac{\mu_0}{4} \right] - \tilde{\delta}\,\|v\| - \frac{\mu_0}{2}\,\|v\|\,\|w\| \\
&\geq \|w\|\,\|v\|\,\frac{3\mu_0}{4} - 2\tilde{\delta}\,\|v\| - \frac{\mu_0}{2}\,\|v\|\,\|w\| = \left(\frac{\mu_0\,\|w\|}{4} - 2\tilde{\delta} \right) \|v\| = \tilde{\delta}\,\|v\| \ .
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. ■

10 Appendix A: Proofs of some technical lemmas

Proof of Lemma 5.4. (a) Let $u, u' \in \widehat{U}_i$ for some $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Given $v \in \widehat{U}$ with $\sigma^m(v) = u$, let $C[\imath] = C[i_0, \ldots, i_m]$ be the cylinder of length m containing v (see the beginning of Sect. 3). Since the sequence $\imath = [i_0, \ldots, i_m]$ is admissible, the Markov property implies $i_m = i$ and $\sigma^m(\widehat{C}[\imath]) = \widehat{U}_i$. Moreover, $\sigma^m : \widehat{C}[\imath] \longrightarrow \widehat{U}_i$ is a homeomorphism, so there exists a unique $v' = v'(v) \in \widehat{C}[\imath]$ such that $\sigma^m(v') = u'$. By (2.1), $d(\sigma^j(v), \sigma^j(v'(v))) \leq \frac{1}{c_0\,\gamma^{m-j}}\, d(u, u')$ for all $j = 0, 1, \ldots, m-1$. This and (2.2) imply

$$|f^{(a)}_m(v) - f^{(a)}_m(v')| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \frac{\mathrm{Lip}(f^{(a)})}{c_0\,\gamma^{m-j}}\, d(u, u') \leq \frac{T}{c_0\,(\gamma-1)}\, d(u, u') \leq \frac{T}{c_0\,(\gamma-1)}\, D(u, u') \ .$$

Also notice that if $D(u, u') = \mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}')$ for some cylinder $\mathcal{C}' = C[i_m, i_{m+1}, \ldots, i_p]$, then $v, v'(v) \in \mathcal{C}'' = C[i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_p]$ for some cylinder $\mathcal{C}''$ with $\sigma^m(\mathcal{C}'') = \mathcal{C}'$, so $D(v, v'(v)) \leq \mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}'') \leq \frac{1}{c_0\,\gamma^m}\,\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{C}') = \frac{D(u,u')}{c_0\,\gamma^m}$.

Using the above, $\mathrm{diam}(U_i) \leq 1$, the definition of $\mathcal{M}_a$, and the fact that $\mathcal{M}_a 1 = 1$ (hence $\mathcal{M}^m_a 1 = 1$), and assuming $A_0 \geq e^{\frac{T}{c_0\,(\gamma-1)}}/c_0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{|(\mathcal{M}^m_a H)(u) - (\mathcal{M}^m_a H)(u')|}{\mathcal{M}^m_a H(u')} = \frac{\left| \sum_{\sigma^m v = u} e^{f^{(a)}_m(v)}\, H(v) - \sum_{\sigma^m v = u} e^{f^{(a)}_m(v'(v))}\, H(v'(v)) \right|}{\mathcal{M}^m_a H(u')} \\
\leq\ & \frac{\left| \sum_{\sigma^m v = u} e^{f^{(a)}_m(v)}\,(H(v) - H(v'(v))) \right|}{\mathcal{M}^m_a H(u')} + \frac{\sum_{\sigma^m v = u} \left| e^{f^{(a)}_m(v)} - e^{f^{(a)}_m(v'(v))} \right| H(v'(v))}{\mathcal{M}^m_a H(u')} \\
\leq\ & \frac{\sum_{\sigma^m v = u} e^{f^{(a)}_m(v)}\, B\, H(v'(v))\, D(v, v'(v))}{\mathcal{M}^m_a H(u')} + \frac{\sum_{\sigma^m v = u} \left| e^{f^{(a)}_m(v) - f^{(a)}_m(v'(v))} - 1 \right| e^{f^{(a)}_m(v'(v))}\, H(v'(v))}{\mathcal{M}^m_a H(u')} \\
\leq\ & e^{\frac{T}{c_0\,(\gamma-1)}}\, \frac{B\, D(u, u')}{c_0 \gamma^m} + e^{\frac{T}{c_0\,(\gamma-1)}}\, \frac{T}{c_0\,(\gamma-1)}\, D(u, u') \leq A_0 \left[\frac{B}{\gamma^m} + \frac{T}{\gamma-1} \right] D(u, u') \ .
\end{aligned}$$

(b) The proof of this part is very similar to the above and we omit it. ■

To prove Lemma 5.10 we need the following lemma which coincides with Lemma 14 in [D2] and its proof is almost the same, so we omit it.

Lemma 10.1. *If h and H satisfy* (5.14)-(5.15)*, then for any $j = 1, \dots, q$, $i = 1, 2$ and $\ell = 1, \dots, j_0$ we have:*

(a) $\frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{H(v_i^{(\ell)}(u'))}{H(v_i^{(\ell)}(u''))} \leq 2$ *for all* $u', u'' \in \widehat{Z}_j$;

(b) *Either for all $u \in \widehat{Z}_j$ we have $|h(v_i^{(\ell)}(u))| \leq \frac{3}{4} H(v_i^{(\ell)}(u))$, or $|h(v_i^{(\ell)}(u))| \geq \frac{1}{4} H(v_i^{(\ell)}(u))$ for all $u \in \widehat{Z}_j$.*

Proof of Lemma 5.10. Given $j = 1, \dots, q$, let $m = 1, \dots, p$ be such that $\mathcal{D}_j \subset \mathcal{C}_m$. By (5.5), $\delta = \epsilon_1/|b| \in (0, \delta']$, so it follows from (5.3) that $\mathcal{C}_m \subset M_{\xi_\ell}^{(\delta)}(U_0)$ for some $\ell = 1, \dots, j_0$. This means that there exist $u, v \in \mathcal{C}_m$ such that $d(u, v) \geq \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{diam}(\mathcal{C}_m)$ and $\left\langle \frac{r^{-1}(v) - r^{-1}(u)}{\|r^{-1}(v) - r^{-1}(u)\|} \, , \, \xi_\ell \right\rangle \geq \theta_1$. Let $j', j'' = 1, \dots, q$ be such that $u \in \mathcal{D}_{j'}$ and $v \in \mathcal{D}_{j''}$. (Notice that we may have $j' = j$ or $j'' = j$.) Then $\mathcal{D}_{j'}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{j''}$ are ξ_ℓ-separable in $\mathcal{C}_m$.

Fix ℓ, j' and j'' with the above properties, and set $\widehat{Z} = \widehat{Z}_j \cup \widehat{Z}_{j'} \cup \widehat{Z}_{j''}$. If there exist $t \in \{j, j', j''\}$ and $i = 1, 2$ such that the first alternative in Lemma 10.1(b) holds for $\widehat{Z}_t$, ℓ and i, then $\mu \leq 1/4$ implies $\chi_\ell^{(i)}(u) \leq 1$ for any $u \in \widehat{Z}_t$.

Assume that for every $t \in \{j, j', j''\}$ and every $i = 1, 2$ the second alternative in Lemma 10.1(b) holds for $\widehat{Z}_t$, ℓ and i, i.e. $|h(v_i^{(\ell)}(u))| \geq \frac{1}{4} H(v_i^{(\ell)}(u)) \quad , \quad u \in \widehat{Z}$.

Since $\psi(\widehat{Z}) = \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_j \cup \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{j'} \cup \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{j''} \subset \mathcal{C}_m$, given $u, u' \in \widehat{Z}$ we have $\sigma^{N-n_1}(v_i^{(\ell)}(u)), \sigma^{N-n_1}(v_i^{(\ell)}(u')) \in \mathcal{C}_m$. Notice that by Proposition 3.1, $\mathcal{C}' = \tilde{v}_i^{(\ell)} \circ w_i^{(\ell)}(\mathcal{C}_m)$ is a cylinder. Moreover, σ^{N-n_1} is expanding on $\mathcal{C}'$, so by (2.1) and (5.6), $\operatorname{diam}(\mathcal{C}') \leq \frac{\operatorname{diam}(\mathcal{C}_m)}{c_0 \, \gamma^{N-n_1}} \leq \frac{\epsilon_1}{c_0 \, \gamma^{N-n_1} \, |b|}$. Thus, using the above assumption, (5.14), (5.15), (5.1) and the constant c_2 from Lemma 5.9, and assuming e.g. $|h(v_i^{(\ell)}(u))| \geq |h(v_i^{(\ell)}(u'))|\}$, we get

$$\frac{|h(v_i^{(\ell)}(u)) - h(v_i^{(\ell)}(u'))|}{\min\{|h(v_i^{(\ell)}(u))|, |h(v_i^{(\ell)}(u'))|\}} \leq \frac{E|b| \, H(v_i^{(\ell)}(u'))}{|h(v_i^{(\ell)}(u'))|} D(v_i^{(\ell)}(u), v_i^{(\ell)}(u')) \leq 4E|b| \operatorname{diam}(\mathcal{C}') \leq \frac{c_2 \epsilon_1}{8} < 1 \, .$$

Thus, the angle between the complex numbers $h(v_i^{(\ell)}(u))$ and $h(v_i^{(\ell)}(u'))$ (regarded as vectors in $\mathbb{R}^2$) is less than $\pi/3$. In particular, we can choose real continuous functions $\theta_i(u)$, $u \in \widehat{Z}$, $i = 1, 2$, with values in $[0, \pi/3]$ such that $h(v_i^{(\ell)}(u)) = e^{\mathbf{i}\theta_i(u)} |h(v_i^{(\ell)}(u))|$ for all $u \in \widehat{Z}$. Using the above, $\theta \leq 2 \sin \theta$ for $\theta \in [0, \pi/3]$, and some elementary geometry yields $|\theta_i(u) - \theta_i(u')| \leq 2 \sin |\theta_i(u) - \theta_i(u')| < \frac{c_2 \epsilon_1}{8}$.

Consider the function

$$\Gamma_\ell(u) = \operatorname{Arg}\left(e^{\mathbf{i}\, b\, \tau_N(v_1^{(\ell)}(u))} \, h(v_1^{(\ell)}(u)) \right) - \operatorname{Arg}\left(e^{\mathbf{i}\, b\, \tau_N(v_2^{(\ell)}(u))} \, h(v_2^{(\ell)}(u)) \right) \, .$$

Notice that by the Remark before Lemma 5.9, the set $\{|\gamma_\ell(u') - \gamma_\ell(u'')| : u' \in \widehat{Z}_{j'}, u'' \in \widehat{Z}_{j''}\}$ is contained in an interval of length $< 1/4$. Given $u' \in \widehat{Z}_{j'}$ and $u'' \in \widehat{Z}_{j''}$, since $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{j'}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{j''}$ are contained in $\mathcal{C}_m$ and are ξ_ℓ-separable in $\mathcal{C}_m$, it follows from Lemma 5.9 and the above that

$$|\Gamma_\ell(u') - \Gamma_\ell(u'')| \geq |\gamma_\ell(u') - \gamma_\ell(u'')| - |\theta_1(u') - \theta_1(u'')| - |\theta_2(u') - \theta_2(u'')| \geq \frac{c_2 \epsilon_1}{2} \, ,$$

Thus, $|\Gamma_\ell(u') - \Gamma_\ell(u'')| \geq \frac{c_2}{2}\epsilon_1$ for all $u' \in \widehat{Z}_{j'}$ and $u'' \in \widehat{Z}_{j''}$. Hence either $|\Gamma_\ell(u')| \geq \frac{c_2}{4}\epsilon_1$ for all $u' \in \widehat{Z}_{j'}$ or $|\Gamma_\ell(u'')| \geq \frac{c_2}{4}\epsilon_1$ for all $u'' \in \widehat{Z}_{j''}$. Assuming for example that $|\Gamma_\ell(u)| \geq \frac{c_2}{4}\epsilon_1$ for all $u \in \widehat{Z}_{j'}$, as in [D2] (see also [St1]) one shows that $\chi_\ell^{(1)}(u) \leq 1$ and $\chi_\ell^{(2)}(u) \leq 1$ for all $u \in \widehat{Z}_{j'}$. ■

Proof of Lemma 6.3. Set $C_1 = \frac{10\,D}{1-\gamma}$ and choose $\epsilon_2 \in (0, \epsilon_1/(2C_1)]$ with (6.7) and $\frac{30\,D\,\epsilon_2}{1-\gamma} < \frac{1}{2}$.

(a) Fix arbitrary $z_0 \in \Lambda$ and $z \in W^u_{\epsilon_0}(z_0)$, and let $v \in E^u(z;\epsilon_1)$ and $p \geq 1$ be such that $\|\hat{f}^p_z(v)\| \leq \epsilon_2$. Set $z_j = f^j(z)$, $v_j = \hat{f}^j_z(v) \in E^u(z_j)$ and $w_j = d\hat{f}^j_z(0) \cdot v \in E^u(z_j)$.

Then (6.7) implies

$$(10.1) \qquad \|\hat{f}^k_z(v)\| \leq \frac{1}{\mu_{z_k}} \|\hat{f}_{z_k}(\hat{f}^k_z(v))\| = \frac{1}{\mu_{z_k}} \|\hat{f}^{k+1}_z(v)\| \leq \ldots \leq \frac{1}{\mu_{z_k}\,\mu_{z_{k+1}} \ldots \mu_{z_{p-1}}} \|\hat{f}^p_z(v)\|$$

for all $k = 0, 1, \ldots, p-1$.

By (6.3), $\|\hat{f}_z(v) - d\hat{f}_z(0) \cdot v\| \leq D\,\|v\|^2$, so $w_1 = d\hat{f}_z(0) \cdot v = \hat{f}_z(v) + u_1$ for some $u_1 \in E^u(z_1)$ with $\|u_1\| \leq D\,\|v\|^2$. Hence

$$(10.2) \qquad d\hat{f}^2_z(0) \cdot v = d\hat{f}_{z_1}(0) \circ d\hat{f}_z(0) \cdot v = d\hat{f}_{z_1}(0) \cdot (\hat{f}_z(v)) + d\hat{f}_{z_1}(0) \cdot u_1 \;.$$

Using (6.3) again, $\|\hat{f}_{z_1}((\hat{f}_z(v))) - d\hat{f}_{z_1}(0) \cdot \hat{f}_z(v)\| \leq D\,\|\hat{f}_z(v)\|^2$, so $d\hat{f}_{z_1}(0) \cdot (\hat{f}_z(v)) = v_2 + u_2$ for some $u_2 \in E^u(z_2)$ with $\|u_2\| \leq D\,\|v_1\|^2$. Now (10.2) gives $w_2 = v_2 + u_2 + d\hat{f}_{z_1}(0) \cdot u_1$.

In this way one proves by induction that for any $k = 1, \ldots, p$ we have

$$(10.3) \qquad w_k = v_k + u_k + d\hat{f}_{z_{k-1}}(0) \cdot u_{k-1} + d\hat{f}^2_{z_{k-2}}(0) \cdot u_{k-2} + \ldots + d\hat{f}^{k-1}_{z_1}(0) \cdot u_1 \;,$$

where $u_j \in E^u(z_j)$ and $\|u_j\| \leq D\,\|v_{j-1}\|^2$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, k-1$.

Next, (10.1) implies $\|u_j\| \leq D\,\|v_j\|^2 \leq \frac{D}{\mu^2_{z_j}\,\mu^2_{z_{j+1}} \cdots \mu^2_{z_{p-1}}} \|\hat{f}^p_z(v)\|^2$. Combining the latter with (6.6) and (6.8) gives $\|d\hat{f}^{p-j}_{z_j}(0) \cdot u_j\| \leq \lambda_{z_j}\,\lambda_{z_{j+1}} \ldots \lambda_{z_{p-1}}\,\|u_j\| \leq D\,\gamma^{p-j}\,\|\hat{f}^p_z(v)\|^2$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, p$. It then follows by (10.3) with $k = p$ that

$$\|d\hat{f}^p_z(0) \cdot v - \hat{f}^p_z(v)\| = \|w_p - v_p\| \leq D\,\|\hat{f}^p_z(v)\|^2 \sum_{j=1}^{p} \gamma^{p-j} \leq C_1\,\|\hat{f}^p_z(v)\|^2 \;.$$

According to the choice of ϵ_2, the latter implies $\|d\hat{f}^p_z(0) \cdot v\| \leq 2\|\hat{f}^p_z(v)\|$.

To prove the second half of part (a), assume that $\|d\hat{f}^p_z(0) \cdot v\| \leq \epsilon_2$. Then (6.6) implies $\|d\hat{f}^p_z(0) \cdot v\| = \|d\hat{f}^{p-j}_{z_j}(0) \cdot w_j\| \geq \mu_{z_j}\,\mu_{z_{j+1}} \ldots \mu_{z_{p-1}}\,\|w_j\|$, so

$$(10.4) \qquad \|w_j\| \leq \frac{1}{\mu_{z_j}\,\mu_{z_{j+1}} \ldots \mu_{z_{p-1}}} \|d\hat{f}^p_z(0) \cdot v\| \quad , \quad 0 \leq j \leq p-1 \;.$$

We will show by induction on k that $v_k = \hat{f}^k_z(v)$ is well-defined and $v_k \in E^u(z_k;\epsilon_1)$ for all $k = 0, 1, \ldots, p$. It follows from (6.3) and (10.4) that

$$\|w_{k+1} - \hat{f}_{z_k}(w_k)\| = \|d\hat{f}_{z_k}(0) \cdot w_k - \hat{f}_{z_k}(w_k)\| \leq D\,\|w_k\|^2 \leq \frac{D}{\mu^2_{z_k}\,\mu^2_{z_{k+1}} \ldots \mu^2_{z_{p-1}}} \|d\hat{f}^p_z(0) \cdot v\|^2 \;.$$

This and (6.8) yield (showing in the meantime by induction that $\hat{f}^{p-k}_{z_k}(w_k) \in E^u(z_p;\epsilon_1)$ for all k)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{f}^{p-k-1}_{z_{k+1}}(w_{k+1}) - \hat{f}^{p-k}_{z_k}(w_k)\| &\leq \lambda_{z_{k+1}}\,\lambda_{z_{k+2}} \ldots \lambda_{z_{p-1}}\,\|w_{k+1} - \hat{f}_{x_k}(w_k)\| \\ &\leq D\,\frac{\lambda_{z_k}}{\mu^2_{z_k}}\,\frac{\lambda_{z_{k+1}}}{\mu^2_{z_{k+1}}} \cdots \frac{\lambda_{z_{p-1}}}{\mu^2_{z_{p-1}}}\,\|d\hat{f}^p_z(0) \cdot v\|^2 \leq D\,\gamma^{p-k}\,\|w_p\|^2 \;. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\|w_p - v_p\| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{p-1} \|\hat{f}_{z_{k+1}}^{p-k-1}(w_{k+1}) - \hat{f}_{z_k}^{p-k}(w_k)\| \leq D\,\|w_p\|^2 \sum_{k=0}^{p-1} \gamma^{p-k} \leq C_1\,\|w_p\|^2$, provided $0 < C_1 \leq \frac{D}{1-\gamma}$. The above also implies $\|v_p\| \leq 2\|w_p\|$.

The proofs of parts (b) and (c) are essentially repetitions of the proof of part (a), so we omit the details.

Part (d) follows easily from part (b). ■

11 Appendix B: Proof of Lemma 8.4

We will use the notation from Sect. 8. Clearly, what enables us to use the arguments from Sects. 6 and 7 is the pinching condition on the spectrum of $d\phi_t$ over the bundle $E^u_1(x)$, and also the invariance of $E^u_1(y)$, $[y,z]^u_y$ and $\widehat{\Lambda}^u_y(\epsilon)$ under $\hat{f}_y^{-1}$.

Set

$$\Lambda^{u,1}_y(\epsilon) = \{\pi^{u,1}_y(z) : z \in \Lambda \cap W^u_\epsilon(y)\} \subset W^{u,1}_\epsilon(y) \quad , \quad \widehat{\Lambda}^{u,1}_y = (\Phi_y)^{-1}(\Lambda^{u,1}_y(\epsilon_2)) \; .$$

It is important properties to notice that $f^{-1}(\Lambda^{u,1}_y(\epsilon)) \subset \Lambda^{u,1}_{f^{-1}(y)}(\epsilon)$ and

$$\hat{f}_y^{-1}(\widehat{\Lambda}^{u,1}_y(\epsilon)) \subset \widehat{\Lambda}^{u,1}_{f^{-1}(y)}(\epsilon) \; . \tag{11.1}$$

Notice that a set of the form $\check{B}^{u,1}_p(y,\epsilon)$ is not necessarily a subset of $\widehat{\Lambda}^u_y(\epsilon)$, however it is contained in $\Phi_y^{-1}(\Lambda^{u,1}_y(\epsilon))$. For $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_2$, $y \in \Lambda$ and $p \geq 0$, the set

$$\widehat{B}^{u,1}_p(y,\epsilon) = \{\Phi_y^{-1}(\pi^{u,1}_y(z)) : z \in \Lambda \cap W^u_\epsilon(y)\;,\; \|\hat{f}^p_y(\Phi_y^{-1}(z))\| \leq \epsilon\} \subset \widehat{\Lambda}^{u,1}_y(\epsilon)$$

does not coincide with $\check{B}^{u,1}_p(y,\epsilon)$, however it follows from (8.1) that

$$\frac{1}{2C}\mathrm{diam}(\check{B}^{u,1}_p(y,\epsilon)) \leq \widehat{B}^{u,1}_p(y,\epsilon) \leq 2C\,\check{B}^{u,1}_p(y,\epsilon) \; .$$

So, it is enough to compare diameters of sets of the form $\widehat{B}^{u,1}_p(y,\epsilon)$.

Next, notice that

$$\|\hat{f}^p_y(v)\| \leq C^2\epsilon \quad \forall v \in \widehat{B}^{u,1}_p(y,\epsilon) \; . \tag{11.2}$$

Given $x_0 \in \Lambda$ and $x \in W^{u,1}_\epsilon(x_0)$, set $E^u_1(x) = T_x(W^{u,1}_\epsilon(x_0))$, and notice that $d\hat{f}_x^{-1}(0)\cdot E^u_1(x) = E^u_1(f^{-1}(x))$.

Using the arguments in Sect. 6 (and the proof of Lemma 6.3 in Appendix A) one derives the following:

Lemma 11.1 *Choosing $\epsilon_2 \in (0, \epsilon_1/2]$ sufficiently small, for any $x_0 \in \Lambda$ and any $x \in W^{u,1}_{\epsilon_2}(x_0)$ we have the following:*

(a) *For every $u \in E^u_1(x;\epsilon_2)$ there exists $F_x(u) = \lim_{p\to\infty} d\hat{f}^p_{f^{-p}(x)}(0)\cdot \hat{f}_x^{-p}(u) \in E^u_1(x; 2\epsilon_2)$. Moreover, there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that $\|F_x(u) - d\hat{f}^p_{f^{-p}(x)}(0)\cdot\hat{f}_x^{-p}(u)\| \leq C_1\,\gamma^p\,\|u\|^2$ for any $u \in E^u_1(x,\epsilon_2)$ and any integer $p \geq 0$.*

(b) *The maps $F_x : E^u_1(x;\epsilon_2) \longrightarrow F_x(E^u_1(x;\epsilon_2)) \subset E^u_1(x;2\epsilon_2)$ are C^1 diffeomorphisms with uniformly bounded derivatives.*

(c) *For any integer $q \geq 1$ we have $d\hat{f}_x^{-q}(0)\circ F_x(v) = F_{f^{-q}(x)}\circ \hat{f}_x^{-q}(v)$ for any $v \in E^u_1(x;\epsilon_2)$.*

(d) *For any* $\xi, u \in E^u_1(x; \epsilon_2/2)$ *there exist the limits* $L_{x,\xi} = \lim_{p\to\infty} d\hat{f}^p_{f^{-p}(x)}(\hat{f}_x^{-p}(\xi)) \circ d\hat{f}_x^{-p}(0)$ *and* $F_{x,\xi}(u) = \lim_{p\to\infty} d\hat{f}^p_{f^{-p}(x)}(\hat{f}_x^{-p}(\xi)) \circ \hat{f}_x^{-p}(u)$. *Moreover, for the linear map* $L_{x,\xi} : E^u_1(x) \longrightarrow E^u_1(x)$ *we have* $\|L_{x,\xi}\| \leq 2$, *and* $F_{x,\xi}(u) = L_{x,\xi} \circ F_x(u)$.

(e) *For any* $t \geq 0$ *and any* $u \in E^u_1(x; \epsilon_2)$ *we have* $F_x(u) = \lim_{t\to\infty} d\phi_t(\phi_{-t}(x)) \cdot \hat{\phi}_{x,-t}(u)$ *and* $d\phi_{-t}(x) \cdot F_x(u) = F_{\phi_{-t}(x)}(\hat{\phi}_{x,-t}(u))$, *where* $\hat{\phi}_{x,t} = (\exp^u_{\phi_t(x)})^{-1} \circ \phi_t \circ \exp^u_x$. ■

We omit the proof, since it is almost an one-to-one repetition of the proofs of Lemma 6.3 and Theorem 6.1.

Set $\widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_x = F_x(\widehat{\Lambda}^{u,1}_x(\epsilon_2)) \subset E^u_1(x; 2\epsilon_2)$ for any $x \in \Lambda$. Then, using (11.1) we get

$$d\hat{f}_x^{-1}(0)(\widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_x(\epsilon)) \subset \widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_{f^{-1}(x)}(\epsilon) \ , \tag{11.3}$$

and more generally $d\phi_t(x)(\widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_x(\epsilon)) \subset \widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_{\phi_t(x)}(\epsilon)$ for any $t \leq 0$ and $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_2]$.

It follows from our assumption (LUPC) in Sect. 8 that the distribution $E^s(x) \oplus E^0(x) \oplus E^u_1(x)$ is integrable (see e.g. [Pes]), so assuming $\epsilon_1 > 0$ is sufficiently small, there exist a family of invariant C^2 manifolds $W^{sc}_{\epsilon_1}(x)$, $x \in \Lambda$, tangent to this distribution.

Next, recall the local stable holonomy maps $\mathcal{H}^y_x : W^u_{\epsilon_1}(x) \cap \Lambda \longrightarrow W^u_{\epsilon_0}(y) \cap \Lambda$ ($y \in \Lambda \cap W^s_{\epsilon_0}(x)$) from Sect. 7. Unlike the case considered in Sects. 6 and 7, here there is no natural way to define a continuous map[10] from $\widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_x(\epsilon_2)$ into $\widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_y(\epsilon_1)$. However, we have the following simple lemma which is enough to use the arguments from Sect. 7 in the present situation.

Lemma 11.2. *Assuming* $\epsilon_2 \in (0, \epsilon_1/2]$ *is sufficiently small, for every* $\delta \in (0, \epsilon_2]$, *there exists* $\delta' \in (0, \epsilon]$ *such that for any* $y \in W^s_{\delta'}(x) \cap \Lambda$ *and any* $u \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_x(\epsilon_2)$ *there exists* $v \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_y(\epsilon_1)$ *with* $\mathrm{dist}(u, v) < \delta$, *where* dist *is the distance on* TM *induced by the Riemann metric.*

Proof of Lemma 11.2. It is enough to deal with elements of $\Lambda^{u,1}_x(\epsilon_2) = \pi^{u,1}_x(W^u_\epsilon(x) \cap \Lambda)$ and $\Lambda^{u,1}_y(\epsilon_0)$.

Given $x \in \Lambda$, let $\pi_x : B(x, \epsilon_1) \cap \Lambda \longrightarrow W^{sc}_{\epsilon_0}(x)$ be the projection along leaves of $W^{u,2}$. It is well-known (see e.g. [Pes] or [HPS]) that π_x is uniformly (Hölder) continuous, so given $\delta > 0$, there exists $\delta'' > 0$ such that if $z' \in W^{sc}_{\delta''}(z) \cap \Lambda$ for some $z \in \Lambda$, then $d(\pi_x(z), \pi_x(z')) < \delta$. Now take $\delta' > 0$ so small that if $y \in W^s_{\delta'}(x) \cap \Lambda$, then $d(z, \mathcal{H}^y_x(z)) < \delta''$ for any $z \in W^u_{\epsilon_1}(x) \cap \Lambda$.

With this choice of δ', let $y \in W^s_{\delta'}(x) \cap \Lambda$. Given any $x' \in \Lambda^{u,1}_x(\epsilon_2)$, we will show that there exists $y' \in \Lambda^{u,1}_y(\epsilon_1)$ with $d(x', y') < \delta$. Indeed, there exists $\xi \in W^u_{\epsilon_1}(x) \cap \Lambda$ with $x' = \pi^{u,1}_x(\xi)$. Setting $\eta = \mathcal{H}^y_x(\xi)$ and $y' = \pi^{u,1}_y(\eta)$, we get $\eta \in W^u_{\epsilon_1}(y) \cap \Lambda$, so $y' \in \Lambda^{u,1}_y(\epsilon_1)$. Moreover, $d(\xi, \eta) < \delta''$, so $d(x', y') = d(\pi(\xi), \pi(\eta)) < \delta$. ■

For $x \in \Lambda$ and $y \in \Lambda \cap W^u_{\epsilon_2}(x)$ (with a global sufficiently small constant $\epsilon_2 > 0$, as always), let π^y_x be the *projection* along $W^{u,2}$ leaves from $W^{u,1}_{\epsilon_2}(x)$ to $W^{u,1}_{\epsilon_1}(y)$. Initially, π^y_x is only defined on $\{\pi^{u,1}_x(z) : z \in \Lambda \cap W^u_{\epsilon_0}(x)\}$. Moreover, the maps π^y_x are (uniformly) C^1 (see Theorem 6.1 in [HPS] or [Pes]), so taking $\epsilon_2 > 0$ sufficiently small and using Whitney's extension theorem, we can assume that π^y_x has a C^1 extension $\pi^y_x : W^{u,1}_{\epsilon_2}(x) \longrightarrow W^{u,1}_{\epsilon_1}(y)$. Then, assuming that $\epsilon_3 > 0$ is sufficiently small and $y \in \Lambda \cap W^u_{\epsilon_3}(x)$, define the map $\hat{\pi}^y_x : E^u_1(x; \epsilon_2) \longrightarrow E^u_1(y; \epsilon_1)$ by $\hat{\pi}^y_x = (\Phi_y)^{-1} \circ \pi^y_x \circ \Phi_x$. We can assume that the constant $C > 0$ is taken so large that $\|\hat{\pi}^y_x(u) - \hat{\pi}^y_x(v)\| \leq C\,\|u - v\|$ for all $u, v \in E^u_1(x; \epsilon_2)$ and all x, y as above.

---

[10] Notice that the map $(\Phi_y)^{-1} \circ \mathcal{H}^y_x \circ \Phi_x$ does not necessarily send $\widehat{\Lambda}^{u,1}_x(\epsilon_2)$ into $\widehat{\Lambda}^{u,1}_y(\epsilon_1)$, since in general $\mathcal{H}^y_x$ does not map $W^{u,2}$ leaves into $W^{u,2}$ leaves.

In order to prove an analogue of Lemma 7.5 in the present situation we need the following which is the analogue of formula (6.10).

Lemma 11.3. *Let* $x \in \Lambda$, $y \in \Lambda \cap W^u_{\epsilon_3}(x)$ *and let* $\eta = \hat{\pi}^y_x(0)$. *Then for any* $u \in E^u_1(x; \epsilon_2)$ *we have* $F_x(u) = d\hat{\pi}^y_x(\eta) \circ L_{y,\eta} \cdot [F_y(\tilde{\pi}^y_x(u)) - F_y(\eta)]$. ■

The proof is essentially a repetition of the proof of formula (6.10) with small modifications, so we omit it.

Next, given $x \in \Lambda$, let $m_x \geq 1$ be the minimal integer such that there exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(x) \leq \epsilon_3$ with $\dim(\mathrm{span}(\widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_x(\delta))) = m_x$ for all $0 < \delta \leq \epsilon$. Then the linear subspace $E^{u,1}_\Lambda(x) = \mathrm{span}(\widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_x(\delta))$ of $E^u_1(x)$ is the same for all $\delta \in (0, \epsilon]$. As in Sect. 7, m_x is ϕ_t-invariant, and using the argument from the proof of Lemma 7.5 with minor modifications, we get the following.

Lemma 11.4. *There exists an integer* m *such that* $m_x = m$ *for any* $x \in \Lambda$. *Moreover, we can choose* $\epsilon_3 > 0$ *so that for any* $x \in \Lambda$ *we have* $E^{u,1}_\Lambda(x) = \mathrm{span}(\widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_x(\epsilon_3))$ *and there exists* $\epsilon = \epsilon(x) \in (0, \epsilon_3]$ *such that* $E^{u,1}_\Lambda(y)$ *depends continuously on* $y \in W^s_\epsilon(x) \cap \Lambda$. ■

For $z \in \Lambda$, $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_2]$ and an integer $p \geq 0$ set $\widetilde{B}^{u,1}_p(z, \epsilon) = F_z(\widehat{B}^{u,1}_p(z, \epsilon)) \subset \widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_z(\epsilon)$.

As in the proof of Lemma 7.2, to prove part (a) of Lemma 8.4 we have to establish the following.

Lemma 11.5. *For any* $0 < \delta \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_3/2$ *there exist a constant* $D = D(x, \delta, \epsilon) > 0$ *and an open neighbourhood* V_0 *of* x *in* $W^s_{\epsilon_0}(x) \cap \Lambda$ *such that* $\ell\left(\widetilde{B}^u_p(y_p, \epsilon)\right) \leq D\, \ell\left(\widetilde{B}^u_p(y_p, \delta)\right)$ *for any* $y \in V_0$ *and any integer* $p \geq 0$.

Proof of Lemma 11.5. Choose $\epsilon = \epsilon(x) \in (0, \epsilon_3]$ so that $E^{u,1}_\Lambda(y)$ depends continuously on $y \in W^s_\epsilon(x) \cap \Lambda$. For any $y \in W^s_\epsilon(x) \cap \Lambda$ choose and fix an orthonormal basis $e_1(y), e_2(y), \ldots, e_m(y)$ in $E^{u,1}_\Lambda(y)$ which depends continuously on y.

Let $0 < \delta \leq \epsilon \leq \epsilon_3/(4C^2)$. By the definition of $E^{u,1}_\Lambda(x)$ and Lemma 11.4, there exist $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_m \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_x(\delta/(2C^2))$ which are linearly independent. Set $\Delta = \Delta(x, \delta) = \mathrm{Vol}_m[u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_m] > 0$, where $[u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_m]$ denotes the parallelepiped in $E^{u,1}_\Lambda(x)$ determined by the vectors $u_1, \ldots, u_m$. Using Lemma 11.2, choose an open neighbourhood V_0 of x in $W^s_\epsilon(x) \cap \Lambda$ such that for any $y \in W^s_\epsilon(x) \cap \Lambda$ there exist $u_1(y), \ldots, u_m(y) \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_y(\delta/C^2)$ with $\mathrm{Vol}_m[u_1(y), u_2(y), \ldots, u_m(y)] \geq \frac{\Delta}{2}$ and $\frac{\|u_j\|}{2} \leq \|u_j(y)\| \leq 2\|u_j\|$ for all $y \in V_0$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. Fix such $u_j(y)$ for any $y \in V_0$ and let $L_y = L(x, y, \delta) : E^{u,1}_\Lambda(y) \longrightarrow E^{u,1}_\Lambda(y)$ be the linear operator such that $L_y u_j(y) = e_j(y)$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, m$. It then follows that there exists a constant $b = b(x, \delta) > 0$ (determined by Δ and $\|u_1\|, \ldots, \|u_m\|$) such that $\|L_y\| \leq b$ for all $y \in V_0$.

Fix for a moment $y \in V_0$. Consider an arbitrary integer $p \geq 1$ and set $z = f^{-p}(y) \in \Lambda$. Given $v \in \widetilde{B}^{u,1}_p(z, \epsilon)$, we have $v = F_z(w)$ for some $w \in \widehat{B}^{u,1}(z, \epsilon)$, and it follows from Lemma 11.1(c) and (11.2) that $\|d\hat{f}^p_z(0) \cdot v\| = \|d\hat{f}^p_z(0) \cdot F_z(w)\| = \|F_y(\hat{f}^p_z(w))\| \leq 2\|\hat{f}^p_z(w)\| \leq 2C^2\epsilon \leq \epsilon_3/2$. Now $\widetilde{B}^{u,1}_p(z, \epsilon) \subset \widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_z(\epsilon)$ implies $v \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_z(\epsilon)$, so $u = d\hat{f}^p_z(0) \cdot v \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_y(2C^2\epsilon) \subset E^{u,1}_\Lambda(y)$. Consequently, $u = \sum_{s=1}^m c_s\, u_s(y)$ for some real numbers c_s, so $L_y u = \sum_{s=1}^m c_s L_y(u_s(y)) = \sum_{s=1}^m c_s e_s(y)$. Thus, $\sqrt{\sum_{s=1}^m c_s^2} = \|L_y u\| \leq \|L_y\|\, \|u\| \leq 2C^2\epsilon\, b$, and so $|c_s| \leq 2C^2\epsilon\, b$ for all $s = 1, \ldots, m$.

By (11.3), $v_j = d\hat{f}^{-p}_y(0) \cdot u_j(y) \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_z(\delta)$. Moreover, we have $v_j \in \widetilde{B}^u_p(z, \delta)$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, m$. Indeed, $u_j(y) = F_y(u'_j)$ for some $u'_j \in \widehat{\Lambda}^{u,1}_y(\delta/C^2)$, so $\Phi_y(u'_j) = \pi^{u,1}_y(\eta_j)$ for some $\eta_j \in \Lambda \cap W^u_{\delta/C}(y)$. Then for $v'_j = \hat{f}^{-p}_y(u'_j)$ and $\zeta_j = f^{-p}(\eta_j) \in \Lambda \cap W^u_{\delta/C}(z)$ we have $v'_j = \Phi_z^{-1} \circ f^{-p}\Phi_y(u'_j) \in \widehat{\Lambda}^{u,1}_z(\delta)$, and therefore $v_j = d\hat{f}^{-p}_y(0) \cdot F_y(u'_j) = F_z(\hat{f}^{-p}_y(u'_j)) = F_z(v'_j) \in \widetilde{\Lambda}^{u,1}_z(\delta)$. It follows from $\eta_j \in W^u_{\delta/C}(y)$ that $\|\Phi_y^{-1}(\eta_j)\| \leq \delta$, so $\|\hat{f}^p_z(\Phi_z^{-1}(\zeta_j))\| = \|\Phi_y^{-1}(\eta_j)\| \leq \delta$ and therefore $v'_j \in \widehat{B}^{u,1}_p(z, \delta)$.

This gives $v_j = F_z(v'_j) \in \widetilde{B}^{u,1}_p(z,\delta)$, so $\|v\| = \|d\hat{f}_y^{-p}(0) \cdot u\| = \left\|\sum_{s=1}^m c_s\, d\hat{f}_y^{-p}(0) \cdot u_s(y)\right\| \leq m\,2C^2\epsilon\, b \max_{1\leq s\leq m} \|v_s\| \leq m\,2C^2\epsilon\, b\, \ell(\widetilde{B}^u_p(z,\delta))$. Hence $\ell\left(\widetilde{B}^u_p(z,\epsilon)\right) \leq D\,\ell\left(\widetilde{B}^u_p(z,\delta)\right)$, where $D = D(x,\delta,\epsilon) = m\,2C^2\epsilon\, b$. ■

As in Sect. 7, the proof of part (b) of Lemma 8.4 is essentially a repetition of the above argument, so we omit the details. ■

Acknowledgements. Thanks are due to Keith Burns, Boris Hasselblatt, Charles Pugh and Amie Wilkinson for various kind of information they have provided to me. The work on this article started a long time ago during my visit to the Erwin Schrödinger Institute in Vienna for the Program on Scattering Theory in 2001 organized by Vesselin Petkov, Andras Vasy and Maciej Zworski. Just by chance a significant part of the work on the latest revision of the paper was done during my visit to ESI for the Program on Hyperbolic Dynamical Systems in 2008 organized by Domokos Szász, Lai-Sang Young and Harald Posch. Thanks are due to the organizers of these events and to the staff of ESI for their hospitality and support.

References

[An] N. Anantharaman, Precise counting results for closed orbits of Anosov flows, Ann. Scient. Éc. Norm. Sup. **33**, 33-56 (2000)

[BaT] V. Baladi and M. Tsujii, Anisotropic Hölder and Sobolev spaces for hyperbolic diffeomorphisms, Ann. Inst. Fourier **57**, 127-154 (2007)

[BaV] V. Baladi and B. Vallée, Exponential decay of correlations for surface semiflows without finite Markov partitions, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **133**, 865-874 (2005)

[B] R. Bowen, Symbolic dynamics for hyperbolic flows, Amer. J. Math. **95**, 429-460 (1973)

[BR] R. Bowen and D. Ruelle, The ergodic theory of Axiom A flows, Invent. Math. **29**, 181-202 (1975)

[BSC] L. Bunimovich, Ya. Sinai and N. Chernov, Statistical properties of two-dimensional hyperbolic billiards, Russ. Math. Surveys **46**, 47-106 (1991)

[Ch1] N. Chernov, Markov approximations and decay of correlations for Anosov flows, Ann. of Math. **147**, 269-324 (1998),

[Ch2] N. Chernov, Invariant measures for hyperbolic dynamical systems, In: Handbook of Dynamical Systems, Ed. by A. Katok and B. Hasselblatt, Vol. 1A, pp. 321-407, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2002.

[Ch3] N. Chernov, A stretched exponential bound on time correlations for billiard flows, J. Stat. Phys. **127**, 21-50 (2007)

[ChY] N. Chernov and L.-S. Young, Decay of correlations for Lorentz gases and hard balls, Encycl. of Math. Sc., Math. Phys. II, Vol. 101, Ed. Szasz, 89-120 (2001)

[D1] D. Dolgopyat, On statistical properties of geodesic flows on negatively curved surfaces, PhD Thesis, Princeton University, 1997.

[D2] D. Dolgopyat, On decay of correlations in Anosov flows, Ann. of Math. **147**, 357-390 (1998)

[D3] D. Dolgopyat, Prevalence of rapid mixing in hyperbolic flows, Ergodic Th. & Dyn. Systems **18**, 1097-1114 (1998)

[FMT] M. Field, I. Melbourne and A. Török, Stability of mixing and rapid mixing for hyperbolic flows, Ann. of Math., to appear.

[GHR] M. Guysinsky, B. Hasselblatt and V. Rayskin, Differentiability of the Hartman-Grobman linearization, Discr. Cont. Dyn. Syst. **9**, 979-984 (2003)

[GL] S. Gouëzel and G. Liverani, Banach spaces adapted to Anosov systems, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **26**, 189-217 (2006)

[Ha1] B. Hasselblatt, Regularity of the Anosov splitting and of horospheric foliations, Ergod. Th.& Dynam. Sys. **14**, 645-666 (1994)

[Ha2] B. Hasselblatt, Regularity of the Anosov splitting II, Ergod. Th.& Dynam. Sys. **17**, 169-172 (1997)

[HP] M. Hirsch and C. Pugh, Smoothness of horocycle foliations, J. Differential Geometry **10**, 225-238 (1975)

[HPS] M. Hirsch, C. Pugh and M. Shub, Invariant manifolds, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. **583**, 1977.

[KB] A. Katok and Burns, Infinitesimal Lyapunov functions, invariant cone families and stochastic properties of smooth dynamical systems, Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys. **14**, 757-785 (1994)

[KH] A. Katok and B. Hasselblatt, Introduction to the Modern Theory of Dynamical Systems, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge 1995.

[L1] C. Liverani, Decay of correlations, Ann. of Math. **142**, 239-301 (1995)

[L2] C. Liverani, On contact Anosov flows, Ann. of Math. **159**, 1275-1312 (2004)

[Mel] I. Melbourne, Rapid decay of correlations for nonuniformly hyperbolic flows, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., to appear.

[N] F. Naud, Expanding maps on Cantor sets and analytic continuation of zeta functions, Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup. **38**, 116-153 (2005)

[PP] W. Parry and M. Pollicott, Zeta functions and the periodic orbit structure of hyperbolic dynamics, Astérisque **187-188**, (1990)

[Pes] Ya. Pesin, Lectures on partial hyperbolicity and stable ergodicity, European Mathematical Society, Zürich, 2004.

[PeS1] V. Petkov and L. Stoyanov, Analytic continuation of the resolvent of the Laplacian and the dynamical zeta function, Preprint, Revised 2009 (arXiv: math.AP:0906.0293v2).

[PeS2] V. Petkov and L. Stoyanov, Correlations for pairs of closed trajectories in open billiards, Nonlinearity **22**, 2657-2679 (2009)

[Po] M. Pollicott, On the rate of mixing for Axiom A flows, Invent. Math. **81**, 413-426 (1985)

[PoS1] M. Pollicott and R. Sharp, Exponential error terms for growth functions of negatively curved surfaces, Amer. J. Math. **120**, 1019-1042 (1998)

[PoS2] M. Pollicott and R. Sharp, Asymptotic expansions for closed orbits in homology classes, Geom. Dedicata **87**, 123-160 (2001)

[PoS3] M. Pollicott and R. Sharp, Correlations for pairs of closed geodesics, Invent. Math. **163**, 1-24 (2006)

[PS] C. Pugh and M. Shub, Linearization of normally hyperbolic diffeomorphisms and flows, Invent. Math. **10**, 187-198 (1970)

[PSW] C. Pugh, M. Shub and A. Wilkinson, Hölder foliations, Duke Math. J. **86** (1997), 517-546; Correction: Duke Math. J. **105**, 105-106 (2000)

[Ratc] J. G. Ratcliffe, Foundations of hyperbolic manifolds, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.

[Ra] M. Ratner, Markov partitions for Anosov flows on n-dimensional manifolds, Israel J. Math. **15**, 92-114 (1973)

[R1] D. Ruelle, Flows which do not mix exponentially, C.R.Acad. Sci. Paris **296**, 191-193 (1983)

[R2] D. Ruelle, Thermodynamic formalism, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass., 1978

[Si] Ya. Sinai, Gibbs measures in ergodic theory, Russ. Math. Surveys **27**, 21-69 (1972)

[St1] L. Stoyanov, Spectrum of the Ruelle operator and exponential decay of correlations for open billiard flows, Amer. J. Math. **123**, 715-759 (2001)

[St2] L. Stoyanov, Dolgopyat type estimates for pinched open billiard flows, Preprint 2009 (arXiv: math.DS:0911.5000v2)

[T] M. Tsujii, Quasi-compactness of transfer operators for contact Anosov flows, Preprint, 2008 (arXiv: math.DS:0806.0732v1)

[Y1] L.-S. Young, Statistical properties of systems with some hyperbolicity including certain billiards, Ann. Math. **147**, 585-650 (1998)

[Y2] L.-S. Young, Recurrence times and rates of mixing, Israel J Math. **110**, 153-188 (1999)

University of Western Australia, Crawley WA 6009, Australia
E-mail address: stoyanov@maths.uwa.edu.au